

559

CHURCH HISTORY



Vol. III

JUNE, 1934

No. 2

ANGLICANISM ON THE EVE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

John T. McNeill

THE CONCEPTION OF AUTHORITY IN THE
OXFORD MOVEMENT

T. L. Harris

RECENT RECOGNITION OF ARCHBISHOP PECKHAM—
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

John L. Peckham

THE SIGNIFICANCE TO CHURCH HISTORY OF THE
CHANGE FROM THE TEMPORARY TO THE
PERMANENT IN FOREIGN MISSIONS

William D. Schermerhorn

IN MEMORIAM

BOOK REVIEWS

Published by

The American Society of Church History

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT OF THE
LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1934

FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER.....*President*
JOHN THOMAS MCNEILL*Vice-President*
ABDEL ROSS WENTE.....*Secretary*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS.....*Treasurer*
MATTHEW SPINKA.....*Assistant Secretary*

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL	WILLIAM WARREN SWEET
GEORGE WARREN RICHARDS	CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN
WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON	WILHELM PAUCK
EDWARD STRONG WORCESTER	ROLAND H. BAINTON
WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN	SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, BERNE, INDIANA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year must be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Ave., Chicago, or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Prof. R. H. Nichols, 10 Nelson St., Auburn, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 9, 1934, at the post office at Berne, Ind., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS

FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER, *ex officio*

Vol. III

JUNE, 1934

No. 2

CONTENTS

ANGLICANISM ON THE EVE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT <i>John T. McNeill</i>	95
THE CONCEPTION OF AUTHORITY IN THE OXFORD MOVEMENT <i>T. L. Harris</i>	115
RECENT RECOGNITION OF ARCHBISHOP PECKHAM— BIBLIOGRAPHICAL <i>John L. Peckham</i>	126
THE SIGNIFICANCE TO CHURCH HISTORY OF THE CHANGE FROM THE TEMPORARY TO THE PERMANENT IN FOREIGN MISSIONS <i>William D. Schermerhorn</i>	146
IN MEMORIAM	154
BOOK REVIEWS	155
MECHAM, J. LLOYD: <i>Church and State in Latin America</i>	W. W. Sweet
WALSH, HENRY H.: <i>The Concordat of 1801</i>	Louis Gottschalk
DVORNÍK, FR.: <i>Les Légendes de Constantine et de Méthode Vues de Byzance</i>	Matthew Spinka
COTTON, PAUL: <i>From Sabbath to Sunday</i>	Frederick A. Schilling
MACFARLAND, CHARLES S.: <i>The New Church and the New Germany</i>	Wilhelm Pauck
QUALBEN, LARS P.: <i>A History of the Christian Church</i>	Robert Hastings Nichols
HARPER, GORDON HUNTINGTON, ED.: <i>Cardinal Newman and William Froude, F. R. S.: A Correspondence</i>	T. L. Harris

CONTENTS

MULLER, JAMES A., ED.: <i>The Letters of Stephen Gardiner</i>	M. M. Knappen
RICHARDSON, LEON B., ED.: <i>An Indian Preacher in England</i>	William W. Sweet
SCOTT, S. HERBERT: <i>The Eastern Churches and the Papacy</i>	Matthew Spinka
PAPADOPOULOS, CHRYSOSTOM: <i>Saint Cyril of Alexandria</i>	G. E. Zachariades
TOSTI, DON LOUIS: <i>Pope Boniface VIII and His Times</i>	John T. McNeill

Church History

Vol. III

JUNE, 1934

No. 2

ANGLICANISM ON THE EVE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

JOHN T. McNEILL

The University of Chicago

1. *The Erastian Bondage of the Church:*

The promise of Magna Charta "that the English Church shall be free and have her rights entire and her liberties inviolate," went largely unfulfilled. The autonomy of the Church was dreamt of by men like Stephen Langton and Robert Grosseteste, but it was never realized. In the Middle Ages it was restricted by the assertion of the jurisdiction of the Pope on the one hand, and of the King on the other. Magna Charta marked the humiliation of the King and met with the prompt condemnation of the Pope. By a long series of events between ca. 1350 and ca. 1570, the Pope's cause in England was lost, and in the same course of events the royal power was greatly enhanced. So far as constitutional autonomy was concerned the Church was now in a weaker state than before. The gates of a prison-house of Erastianism closed about her. A blight fell upon her governing institutions. Her Convocations were not permitted to function, and after 1718 were discontinued, except for *pro forma* meetings held for the purpose, as Edmund Burke phrased it, "of making some polite ecclesiastical compliments to the King."¹ Burke spoke for the politicians of his century when he added: "It is wise to permit its legal existence only." Because Convocation's last acts had been attended by strife, the

¹ Letter to the Sheriffs of Bristol, 1777. The lucid and penetrating study of Dr. Gerald B. Switzer, *The Struggle for Autonomy in the Church of England*, 1932, a typewritten dissertation in the library of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, contains a highly useful account of Convocation.

fear that its revival would mean a renewal of unseemly contention was habitually invoked as an answer to the few who ventured to suggest that step.

A few serious churchmen indeed viewed its suppression with shame. Frivolous Boswell was awed by the anger of Dr. Samuel Johnson when on an allusion to the matter in his presence, the noble old bear growled: "Shall the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland have its General Assembly and the Church of England be denied its Convocations?"² While some of the clergy hesitantly suggested the revival of Convocation, no considerable attention to the subject is to be discerned before the late twenties; and then the issue was largely lost sight of through the pressure of more immediate problems. It is interesting that Coleridge in 1829 warmly, if only incidentally, championed the cause of Convocation, affirming that its suppression violated a great principle, and that such a violation of principle would inevitably "avenge itself upon the country."³ A writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* in November, 1830, reports that "many are advocating the restoration of Convocation;" but he raises the old bogey of ecclesiastical quarrels to discourage the proposal, while he looks vaguely to some alternative means of efficient church government.⁴

Incapacitated from any corporate action, the Church was also subjected to a debilitating system of patronage. Coleridge, among those miniature essays contributed to the press and republished as *Essays on His Own Times*, has one satiric fragment which he pompously entitles: "A Defence of the Church Establishment, from its Similitude to the Grand and Simple Laws to the Planetary System." He quotes Newton's *Principia* on centrifugal force, and gravely draws an analogy thus: The sun is the court, the centre of patronage; the planets are the bishops, and they exhibit "a universal gravitation toward the sun of Royal Patronage."⁵

That the effects of patronage by the crown and by the nobility and gentry in the appointments of the bishops and clergy were debilitating to the religious life of the Church, will hardly admit of dispute. The Church was in no position either to maintain her inward discipline, or to furnish a conscience to

² Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, Oxford, 1922, I, 310; Switzer, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

³ Coleridge, *Works*, VI, 88. Cf. p. 77.

⁴ "The Property and Government of the Church of England," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, XXVIII, 1830, 784-811.

⁵ Coleridge, *Essays on His Own Times*, I, 128.

the state. Politics in the Whig era stood at a low level, and the Church inclined to the standards of the politicians who held the ecclesiastical livings in their gift. Bishops or others of the clergy who ventured to hint at the desirability of a reform of the patronage system seemed to bite the hand that fed them; such an attitude, at any rate, did not conduce to the said hand's liberality. It was inevitable that many of the clergy should be of a lax and spineless type, careless of public worship, tolerant of abuses, and timid of change.

The Erastian bondage probably accounts in large measure for the flood of evils with which the Church was infested in the early nineteenth century, though the source of the corruption was seldom recognized. The spiritual vigor aroused by Methodism was drained off from the Church. That movement most unwillingly separated itself, primarily because the ecclesiastical body had lost its nerves of motion and its powers of corporate action. In the year of Wesley's death the spirited Richard Watson, bishop of Llandaff, craved for England the advent of a new Luther who in five years would persuade Parliament "to abolish tithes, to extinguish pluralities, to enforce residence, to confine episcopacy to the overseeing of dioceses, to expunge the Athanasian creed from our Liturgy, to free the Dissenters from the test acts, and the ministers of the Established Church from subscription to human articles of faith."⁶ To join the critics of those inveterate abuses, pluralities and non-residence, was as injudicious for a bishop as to advocate the other liberal changes which Watson suggested for his Luther. Yet we may withhold our tears over Watson's frequent complaints that he was singled out for neglect by the government and kept in the poorest diocese in the country, when we recall that as a non-resident he himself exemplified one of the principal evils he deplored.

Most of the evangelicals seem to have been largely indifferent to the corporate life of the Church. An element among them, notably the Clapham Sect, had, it is true, much concern for the state and for public morality. But in religion their interest lay in the salvation of individuals; they contributed nothing directly to the redemption of the Church from her bondage. Richard Cecil is almost apocalyptic when he views the widespread evils: probably, he thinks, an "infidel persecution—general, bitter, purifying, cementing—" will be permitted, and

⁶ *Anecdotes of Richard Watson*, Philadelphia, 1818, p. 214.

will be more effective to cleanse the church than the "pagan" and the "papal" persecutions of the past.⁷ Joseph Milner's chapter of "Reflections on Ecclesiastical Establishments," which follows in his *History* the account of Theodosius the Great,⁸ shows how completely satisfied with the establishment a devout evangelical scholar might be. "The happy government under which we live has for many years past exhibited to the world a fine example of an ecclesiastical establishment, framed and modeled according to the principles inculcated in this chapter."

H. C. G. Moule has attributed to Charles Simeon "not a little of the revived consciousness of corporate life and duty in the national church" usually connected with the Oxford Movement; but the facts adduced to support this view are not convincing.¹⁰ Evangelicalism had a certain commendable sense of the fraternity of all Christians, but little of that *church sense* which the age, as we now view it, seems to have needed.

2. *Symptoms of the Sick Organism:*

Let us view the scene of ecclesiastical life with some attention to conditions in detail. The Reverend Desmond Morse-Boycott is the latest of a long series of writers who have depicted with realism the symptoms of the sick Church in this period.¹¹ In his chapter entitled "The Valley of Dry Bones," he has put together from contemporary accounts, from the later testimony of witnesses, and even from fiction, a catena of vivid passages by which we are enabled to perceive the prevalence of clerical ignorance, covetousness and inefficiency, the vulgar irreligion of the prosperous classes, and the devotion of the masses on Sundays when freed from toil, not to the altars of the Church, but to the shrines of the "Great Spirit Gin."

I turn, however, to certain sources which he does not employ and which lend further variety to the picture. First, let us note the evidence provided by a clergyman who was also a man of letters whose writings are marked by realism and at the same time by a fundamental sympathy for the establishment.

The early life of George Crabbe (1754-1832) was handi-

⁷ *Remains of Richard Cecil*, ed. Joseph Pratt, 1826, p. 105.

⁸ *The History of the Church of Christ*, Philadelphia, 1845, I, 343-351.

⁹ *The History of the Church of Christ*, I, 350.

¹⁰ Charles Simeon, London, 1905, p. 108. Cf. also L. E. Binns, *The Evangelical Movement in the English Church*, "Faiths" series, 1928, Ch. VIII.

¹¹ *The Secret Story of the Oxford Movement*, London: Skeffington, 1933.

capped by poverty, and he always retained his contact with the underprivileged classes. His poems *The Parish Register*, 1805, and *The Borough*, 1810,¹² reflect his experience as a rector at Aldeburgh, Suffolk, and at Muston, Leicestershire. The closing section of *The Parish Register* introduces the aged sexton, "old Dibble," and recites Dibble's description of the five incumbents whose remains he has interred. There was "Master Addle," impressive while he paced the hallowed aisles with his sevenfold surplice over his ample frame, but dozing in the pulpit where finally he passed away in slumber. Then followed "Parson Peele," who preached from the text "I will not spare you," and in his exactions practiced what he preached. "Doctor Grandspear," on the other hand, was liberal and rich, and loved to feast his friends and to give away half-worn clothing. The "author rector" who followed is Crabbe himself, who shunned conversation with his people, (though he had a liking for vagabonds), was careless of the vestments, and devoted to study. The youth from Cambridge who ends the list is a hot evangelical whose ardor burns out his weak body and leaves him a victim of consumption.

The Borough is in 24 parts called "letters" of which only the second, on the Vicar and the Curate, is of special interest for us. Crabbe's description of the Vicar is that of a Laodicean churchman, pusillanimous and effeminate.

His constant care was, no man to offend.
... Fear was his ruling passion.

He condemns no sin except that of innovation:

... All things new
He deemed superfluous, useless or untrue.

Yet he has won the approval of his parishioners—the rich, the poor, the serious,—and even of the Dissenters, with whom he has carefully avoided conflict. The Curate is a scholar whose life is crushed by poverty. He lives in a poor hut with a sick wife and nine children, and with pathetic eagerness labors to produce a book.

In plain prose other clergymen of the day supply us with more damaging evidence. Charles B. Tayler, (1797-1875) rector of Otley, in *Facts in a Clergyman's Life*, which though published in 1849 reflects experiences of the pre-Tractarian

¹² Both poems are in Volume I of *George Crabbe's Poems*, edited by A. W. Ward. Cf. René Huchon, *George Crabbe and His Times*.

period, describes¹³ the grossly inadequate preparation of the ordinand who gets by the examination of the bishop's chaplain, the fleeting emotion felt in the service of ordination, the dullness and idleness of the young curate, who is seen at every dinner party and sometimes in the ballroom and at the race-course. After a year this shallow youth goes to an elegant rectory. "He has exchanged the easy indifference of the idle curate, for the self-importance and the authority of office of the idle rector." He now develops an interest in church architecture, in apostolic succession, and in abusing the Dissenters. Tayler regrets that many qualified men are obliged to live out their lives as curates while others quite unfit pass promptly to some important charge. Yet he is thankful that he himself spent fifteen years as a curate, and testifies to the kindness with which he was then treated by his superiors.

Edward Stanley (1779-1849), the father of Dean A. P. Stanley, became rector of Alderley, Cheshire, in 1805. Before his coming the services were so neglected by the people that "the clerk used to go to the churchyard stile to see whether any more were coming to church, for there were seldom enough to make a congregation," although the parish numbered 1300. Stanley's predecessor boasted that he never visited the sick. His clerical neighbors were little more efficient. Ignorance and drunkenness prevailed among the people.¹⁴ In 1837 he succeeded the benevolent but indolent Bathurst in the see of Norwich. Non-residence, pluralism, carelessness in admission to orders and in the services, had left that diocese "a byword for laxity" among the sees of the Church. From one point near Norwich nine parishes could be seen which contained only one resident clergyman.¹⁵

The variety of objections taken against ecclesiastical conditions by the numerous pamphleteers of the age may be illustrated from a long anonymous tract entitled: *The State of the Established Church in a Series of Letters of the Right Honorable Spencer Perceval, Chancellor of the Exchequer*, 1810. The booklet is reviewed at length from its second printing in two articles in the *Christian Observer* for 1811.¹⁶ It contained an exposure of the church system under eleven heads as follows:

¹³ Charles B. Tayler, *Facts in a Clergyman's Life*, pp. 9ff.

¹⁴ *Memoirs of Edward and Catherine Stanley*, Edited by A. P. Stanley. London, 1879, pp. 7ff.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 38.

¹⁶ *Christian Observer*, X (1811), pp. 708-720; 778-795.

(1) The state of the universities; (2) Examination for orders; (3) Disposal of patronage; (4) Unequal distribution of church property; (5) Neglect of ecclesiastical discipline; (6) Non-residence; (7) Church warden's oaths at visitations; (8) Neglect or carelessness in pastoral duties; (9) Inaccuracy of returns of the value of small livings; (10) Ill application of Queen Anne's Bounty; (11) Want of churches.

The author finds life at the universities marked by profligacy of manners and neglect of religion. He gives facts to illustrate the prevailing lack of standards for ordination. One of his stories is that of the ordinand who when asked "Who was the mediator between God and man?" replied confidently "The Archbishop of Canterbury." He reports 6120 non-resident clergy in the country, more than half of whom have no just cause of absence.

The reviewer's comments are themselves revealing. He recognizes the pamphleteer's claim that the Scott Bill (1803) had largely failed of its object which was to reduce non-residence by requiring express permission from the bishop. He states that in 1807 there were 2446 non-residents "without notification, license or exemption," and probably nearly 1000 such cases that had nothing to do with the lack or unsuitability of parsonages. Accordingly he favors "still stronger measures" on non-residence and tentatively suggests the division of the greater dioceses, and other reforms; but on the whole he shows no great alarm and is disposed to be hopeful that somehow a better spirit will prevail.

The Church in Danger, 1815, by Richard Yates, had a different emphasis from that of most of this literature of exposure. Yates makes an elaborate analysis of population changes and the inadequacy of church accommodation and organization in the industrial areas. He declares that it is not through non-residence in the well organized parishes that dissent grows or bad conditions enter, but through the futile attempt of one or two clergymen to perform the work which should occupy fifty or sixty. On the estimate that 640 is the average number of persons in an English parish with one minister, he shows how this average is absurdly violated in the London area, where he finds within 8 miles of St. Paul's no less than 943,000 people who have no access to parish churches.¹⁷

¹⁷ See review in *British Critic*, New Series, X, 1818, pp. 1-25.

3. *Bentham and Wade Assail the Establishment:*

The versatile and flippant pen of Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) joined in, and in no small degree inspired, the assault on the Establishment. Its evil case is a subject frequently alluded to throughout his works.¹⁸ In 1818, Bentham published *Church of Englandism and its Catechism Examined*, a work of 746 pages, in which his emphasis is on the hypocrisy involved in subscription to the Articles, and the fleecing of the laity by the clergy. The universities are charged with inculcating insincerity and perjury. Bentham would, if he had his way, wreck the Establishment, leaving only the parish clerk and the vestry. He proposes the abolition of declarations of belief. His shrewd asides include references to a certain periodical characterized by a solicitous jealousy for the clergy, as "St. Quarterly Review," and both the journal thus ironically canonized and the *British Critic* counter-attacked vigorously.¹⁹ Bentham's ecclesiastical philistinism was too coarse to be attractive to any of the Church's well-wishers. But his influence was undoubtedly great among the secularists who desired the humiliation of the Church or the overthrow of the Establishment.

That most famous work of exposure, the *Extraordinary Black Book*, mercilessly depicted the bad conditions. Since some of the histories in common use for this period convey erroneous information about this book it is desirable to clarify the matter briefly here. In the first place, although it appeared anonymously it is undoubtedly the work of John Wade, 1788-1875, a journalist long connected with *The Spectator*. Among Wade's avowed works are: *History of the Middle and Working Classes*, 1835; and *Unreformed Abuses in Church and State*, 1849. These works shed further light on the mind of the author. He was an ardent reformist, even a revolutionist, arguing on principle in the latter of these treatises that revolutions, though painful, are often needful. He was perhaps the first to declare in a historical treatise the social importance of steam power. A man who could write in 1835: "Although the labors of Watt are unnoticed in the general history of the period they have proved of more importance to man than all the contemporary transactions of war and diplomacy,"²⁰ was too keenly alive

18 *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*. Ed. John Bowring. Eleven volumes. Edin. 1843.

19 *Quarterly Review*, XXI, 1819, pp. 167-177. *British Critic*, New Series, X, 1818, pp. 519-528.

20 *History of the Middle and Working Classes*, p. 82.

to the new aspects of his age to be patient with its anachronisms. He is a hater of the children of privilege. His sympathies are with the new classes of society, those connected with the industrial development. Further, Wade's work shows clearly the influence of Gibbon's anti-supernaturalistic account of Christianity; and still more is he under the spell of little Jeremy Bentham. Wade measures the Church with a utilitarian yardstick, regards traditional beliefs with indifference, and delights to revile the aristocracy and the clergy.

Again it may be said that the historical importance of the *Black Book* has little to do with the question of its reliability. Its importance lies in the success with which its focused attention on the abuses of the time, making it impossible for the intelligent Englishman to overlook them.

The work appeared in 1820, under the name of *The Black Book, or Corruption Unmasked*. In the revised and enlarged edition of 1831, called *The Extraordinary Black Book*, the author states that it has already been "ofttimes reprinted," and that "upwards of 14,000 copies have been sold." A comparison of the *Black Book* of 1820 and the *Extraordinary Black Book* of 1831, shows a complete reworking of the material and re-ordering of the parts. The statistical material is largely brought up to date, and some of the more offensive language is eliminated. The 1831 edition has 576 large and closely typed pages, amounting perhaps to 275,000 words. About one-third of it is devoted specifically to the offenses of the Church; in the remainder the abuses of government are exposed with the same ruthlessness.

Wade is indignant at the excessive cost of the Establishment to the nation. "Our national clergy," he states near the beginning, "cost at least eight times more than the national clergy of France." They are not distinguished for learning or morality. They resemble the clergy of the pre-Reformation Roman Church. They have supported every wrong cause—the war against the American colonies, the war against France, and all internal measures to curb freedom and equality. Formerly they defended dogmas; now they defend their tithes. The wealthy prelates crush the poor hard-working vicars who receive less pay than Irish hod-carriers.

From such generalizations we are led to a detailed presentation of the case against the present state of the Establishment. First comes an inquiry as to the origin and tenure of church

property, which contains an attack on the tithing system. Wade jests over the statement of Dr. Cove (deceased) who in support of tithing had been driven to the contention that tithes probably had their origin in "some unrecorded revelation made to Adam." He presents an argument from the practice of Kings and Parliaments that the property of the Church is public property, and can be appropriated or redistributed at will by the government. The Church, as a propertied institution, is in the same position as the army.

Secondly, he deals with patronage. Here he aims to show *inter alia* that the sale of advowsons (the right of presentation), which is legal, tends to simony in the obtaining of livings, which is illegal but widespread. "Offices are regularly kept in which spiritual preferment is sold as regularly as offices in the East Indies." Subserviency to the political powers is the policy by which the high offices of the Church are obtained. Here Wade recites a mass of depressing facts. Nepotism is a phase of the picture. The Bishop of Ely (Sparke), with an income of £27,742, has secured to his son six benefices, and five to his son-in-law. The author deals in detail with parochial patronage, and gives tabular statements. Of 7,191 persons holding 11,342 livings, 4,305 are found to possess only one each; 2,037 have two each; the others range from 567 who have three each, to one splendid pluralist who has eleven.

Thirdly, he takes up in one section the flagrant abuses of sinecurism, non-residence, pluralities, and the failure of discipline. The evidence regarding non-residence is taken in part from the letters of William Wright in *The Morning Chronicle*, 6 Nov. 1813—11 Mar. 1814. The author uses also the Diocesan Returns to the Privy Council for 1827 and previous years. Non-residence is obtained on physician's certificates that are years out of date. In 1827, only 3,598 out of the 10,583 clergymen resided in their own parsonages; 815 others were within two miles of their churches; while 6,120 were non-residents. He complains that Mr. Wright's efforts to obtain legal judgments against non-residents on the basis of the Act of 1803 had been halted by the Act of 1813, by which "the Church received a complete whitewashing." He points to the sale and exchange of sermon manuscripts as evidence of the indolence of the clergy.

His fourth head is the Revenues of the Clergy. After much argument he estimates the total revenue of the ministers of the Establishment at £9.459.585. Army officers, lawyers and

physicians have no such emoluments. "The church is a monstrous overgrown Croesus in the state, and the amount of its revenues incredible, unbearable, and out of proportion with every class in society." Less than half of the clergy enjoy nearly the whole of this excessive revenue, while the "laboring bees," the curates, are shamefully underpaid. All this is supported by tables of statistics. A further table shows the comparative expense of what (following Bentham) Wade calls "Church of Englandism," and the church systems of other countries. The astonishing result is reached that 201,728,000 Christian people in other lands get their religion at about 5% less yearly than is expended through the Church of England with adherents numbering only 6½ millions.

Of the fifth and sixth sections of this arraignment, dealing with "clerical rapacity" and with "improprieties in the liturgy" respectively, I merely state that they contain harsh and caustic criticism.

Wade's suggestions toward reform are set forth sketchily in answer to the question: "Who would be benefitted by a reform of the Church?" Before noting proposals contained in this section, let us introduce another topic.

4. *Parliamentary Measures Affecting the Church:*

W. G. Peck in *The Social Implications of the Oxford Movement*, 1933, (pp. 10ff), has shown the temper of the advocates of social and political reform in the early part of the century, and reviewed the half-way measures which averted revolution. In the pre-Tractarian period Parliament was also concerned with ecclesiastical matters on numerous occasions, but the legislative results of its efforts were superficial. The measures taken to relieve the distressed curates, and to secure residence, are those of chief interest to us. "An act for the further support and maintenance of curates," which provided for a *maximum* salary of £75, with a house, or £15 in lieu of one, was passed in 1796. A bill introduced in 1802 by Sir William Scott came out much revised in 1803 as "An act for encouraging the residence of stipendiary curates."²¹ It is a long and involved act²² designed both to encourage residence and to replace the antiquated penalties of a law of Henry VIII with new ones.

²¹ *Statutes of the Realm*, 36 Geo. IV. c. 83.

²² 43 Geo. III, c. 84, July 7, 1803, Cf. Cobbett, W., *Parliamentary History of England*, XXXVI, 443ff; 882ff.

A regular method for the licensing of non-residents was provided. Informers were to be rewarded by receiving the amounts recovered by way of penalty,—a proportion of the income differing according to conditions.

One William Wright of Bridge Court, for some years Secretary to the Bishops of Ely, Oxford, Norwich, and St. Davids, observed the increased violation of this statute after 1808, when a £1 stamp tax was attached to licenses for non-residence. Even though the bishops advertised widely in the press "expressing strong displeasure that the clergy should render this necessary," non-residents neglected to apply for the regular license.²³ Wright accordingly, in the interests of reform and of his bank account, instituted about 200 suits under the statute of 1803. Parliamentarians sprang to the rescue of the prosecuted non-residents. Bragge Bathurst with the assistance of Sir William Scott, chief author of the Act of 1803, prepared and presented Nov. 17, 1813, a bill to stay proceedings, and on Dec. 6, it was law.²⁴ It was renewed the following 19th April, again on 18th May, with additional safeguards for negligent absentees, and again on 19th July; while a permanent measure was in preparation.²⁵ On July 30, followed "An Act to restrain and amend several Acts relating to spiritual persons and for enforcing the residence of such persons," which so limits the recovery of penalties as to discourage Mr. Wright and other litigious persons.²⁶ This nullifying legislation, as Wade indignantly notes,²⁷ met with virtually no resistance from either Whigs or Tories. Meanwhile, a new "Act for the further support and maintenance of curates," July, 1813, dealt with non-residence from another angle. It penalized non-resident incumbents who failed to appoint curates. This Act also provided a minimum salary to curates of £80 except in certain cases; and made the salary proportionate to the value of the benefice.²⁸ It was stoutly resisted by the bishops in the Lords, and the last speaker against it in the Commons, Mr. Pole Carew, declared that it was held objectionable "by all the heads of the church."²⁹ With such resistance it is not sur-

23 Wright's Petition presented against Bragge Bathurst's bill, 1813, as abstracted in the *Journals of the House of Commons*, LXIX, 72.

24 54 Geo. III c. 6. An Act to Stay. . . . Proceedings.

25 See *Journals of the House of Commons*, LXIX, (1813-1814) under dates mentioned.

26 54 Geo. III. c. 175.

27 *Extraordinary Black Book*, pp. 30ff; 35f.

28 53 Geo. III. c. 149. July 20, 1813.

29 Hansard, 1st Ser. XXVI, 210, 295, 1115, 1171, 1197.

prising that the laws against non-residence remained largely unenforced.

In 1817, the legislation governing curacies and residence underwent a revision. By "an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to spiritual persons holding of farms . . . and for the support and maintenance of stipendiary curates"³⁰ the whole body of legislation discussed above was repealed. But the substance of its provisions was reenacted, together with some additional details. The Act fills over thirty pages of the *Statutes of the United Kingdom*, and is carefully unambiguous as well as comprehensive. The bishops are given wide discretion in licensing for non-residence (§15). The intended salary to the curate and the place of the latter's intended residence must be indicated in applications for such license (§18). A full return is to be sent by the bishop to the government before March 25, yearly, reporting the resident and non-resident clergy (§23). Procedure on "monition to reside," against a non-resident, is determined (§§26ff). Curates appointed since the law of 1813, are to be given salaries from £80 to £150 (or the entire income of the benefice if it is worth less), according to the population of the parish. Clause 69 gives the bishop full power to remove summarily any curate "for any cause which shall appear to such bishop good and reasonable," subject to appeal to the archbishop.

The Act was in some quarters regarded as weighted in the interests of the bishops, and the last mentioned clause was resented by the curates to whom it applied.

In that occasional periodical, the *Pamphleteer*, for 1820,³¹ appears an extended reply to the anonymous tract, *The Curates' Appeal to the Equity and Christian Principles of the British Legislature, the Bishops, the Clergy and the Public*. The reply is signed "J. N.," and library cards connect these initials with George Bugg (1769-1851). The *Appeal*, which professes to emanate from half the clergy, protests against the law of 1817, and the arbitrary and cruel treatment accorded to curates under the Act. It especially complains of §69 which, it is claimed, makes the curate a slave. Among the charges made is that the bishops and non-resident rectors are often in collusion, the bishop collecting the penalty and privately returning it. "J. N." denies this charge, vigorously defends the terms of the Act,

³⁰ 57 Geo. III, c. 99 (10 July 1817).

³¹ *The Pamphleteer*, Vol. XVII, pp. 172-199.

claims that the *Appeal* speaks for less than one-twentieth of the curates, and ascribes its spleen to its author's having been removed from his curacy, presumably not without reason.

The Established Church in Ireland had been subjected to continual criticism by reformists, and was extremely unpopular with the Roman Catholic population. In 1831, Lord Grey became Prime minister. Under his leadership Parliament took up the question of Irish church reform in February, 1833, and on July 21, passed the measure known as the Irish Church Act, which provided for the suppression of two of the four archiepiscopal sees, and eight bishoprics. Though a reasonable measure of reform, the Act could not be judged on its intrinsic merits. Both its promoters and its opponents regarded it as preliminary to some drastic move by Parliament to deal fundamentally with the English Establishment. Its significance in the beginnings of Tractarianism is too well known to detain us. Keble's assize sermon preceded by a week the passing of the Act.

5. *Some Projects of Church Reform:*

Professor W. L. Mathieson's chapter on "The Pre-Reform Church, 1815-1832,"³² exhibits the blind hostility of the great majority of the bishops to all measures of political and social reform, and the rising anger of the nation at this obstinate course. We need not here retread that ground. But the result was that by the opening of the thirties, when Catholic Emancipation had come and the Reform Bill of 1832 was assured, the air became thick with projects of church reform. Let us pass in review a few of the writings in which such projects are presented or discussed.

Wade's *Extraordinary Black Book*, as we have seen, is devoted mainly to exposure and only secondarily to ideas of amendment. But he wishes to be thought a friend of the Established Church, and not an advocate of "free trade in religion." An established church, he holds, is needed to maintain the national piety and to temper fanaticism.³³ He is out for the abolition of patronage, and for the abolition of tithes. There should be, he argues, no indemnity to the patrons; such compensation would be "national simony," since the right of advowson is to be considered honorary and not a matter of property. Since

³² *English Church Reform, 1815-1840*, Ch. I

³³ *Extraordinary Black Book*, p. 78.

the inequality of the incomes of the clergy is an incitement to ambition and avarice, he would equalize the value of sees, and by reducing the richly endowed benefices mitigate the penury of the "working clergy." He cites, as do a number of these reformers, the alleged happy state of the Scottish Kirk with a minimum stipend of £150 a year and an average of £245. The wealth of the Scottish Church is not so great as to corrupt its ministry while "the wealth of the English Church is the source of all its vices—sinecurism, pride, luxury and inefficiency." Such a judgment on the wealth of the English ecclesiastics may recall utterances of Wyclif; but the spirit is far from that of the medieval reformer!

No less than twenty-seven separate new publications containing discussions, and in many instances definite projects, of church reform, are reviewed in the *Christian Observer* in the course of the year 1833. In other articles the *Observer* develops its own rather thoroughgoing program. In one of these the program takes shape in a supposed petition to Parliament under eleven heads. Leading points are: provision for adequate preparation for orders; necessity of residence; division of sees so large as to be unworkable; laws to secure responsibility on the part of patrons; restoration of discipline; and the extension of the Church throughout the British Empire.

The tracts reviewed offer much repetition and exhibit varying degrees of radicalism. Nearly half of these writings are anonymous; in some cases the writer indicates that he is a priest or a layman. Two Scottish Presbyterians are among the writers whose names accompany their work. Nearly all the others are specifically indicated to be Anglicans. Two of the writers are entirely negative toward reform; the rich benefices they think must be kept as rewards for the deserving clergy, or as inducements to brilliant youth to take orders.³⁴ Most of the others favor some kind of plan for funding the revenues in order to aid the underpaid clergy at the expense of those overpaid. A number make suggestions for the revision of the Liturgy.³⁵

One of the most radical, and to the *Observer's* reviewer, most alarming of these pamphlets is Dr. Thomas Arnold's *Principles of Church Reform*, which we may more profitably examine from Arnold's own works.³⁶ I first pause, however,

³⁴ *Christian Observer*, 1833. Philadelphia Edition, pp. 131; 159; 243; 267.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 132, 241.

³⁶ *Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold*, 2nd American Edition, 1846, pp. 75-130. The Preface is dated Jan. 9, 1833.

to call attention to an article of Arnold's which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for September, 1826.³⁷ It is a review of a volume entitled *Letters to an Episcopalian* which protested against the abuses of state encroachment. Arnold here points out that state pressure in the Church drives opponents of the state policy into dissent, where such pressure is not exercised. Yet he defends the Establishment against the more radical author of the *Letters*. He wants to see the Church more completely identified with the people. He sets forth at some length three criticisms of the Church as it is: (1) The Church is unpopular. (2) The Church is exclusive. (3) The government of the Church is full of abuses; of which he specifies pluralities, non-residence, and "the total want of any system of education" for the ministry.

In the *Principles of Church Reform*, of which the Preface bears the date January 9, 1833, Arnold's ideas are seen to have matured; but he is still primarily concerned with dissent and the removal of its causes. Arnold is the broadest of Broad Churchmen. He would extinguish dissent, as impairing the usefulness of the Establishment, not by persecution, which is wrong and ineffectual, but by comprehension, which alone can be effectual. He is evidently fearful of an alliance of the Dissenters and the godless against the Church of England. He bravely hopes by altering the Articles and Liturgy to gather in the mass of Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, and even many Unitarians, Quakers, and Roman Catholics. Then he would undertake to remake the outward structure of the Church. The lay people are too passive; they should be given responsibility as parish officers and as lay preachers. The dioceses should be divided so that every large town will have a bishop. The Church should be episcopal without being prelatical: the bishop's power should be exercised in conjunction with a council. Diocesan assemblies should also be created, with lay representatives. There are strong conservative notes in this radical plan. Election by patrons is to remain; but where there is no endowment the minister should be chosen by the people. Arnold is strongly opposed to "church destroyers" or plundering reformers who covet the church properties. The property exists, he points out, in telling words, "to provide in every parish the constant residence of one individual who has no other business than to do good of every kind to every per-

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 213-235.

son." But he is in fact not so much concerned with non-residence in country hamlets as with neglect of crowded town populations served by too few ministers. Arnold's eminence rendered his suggestions weighty. But it was Parliament that was to be the Church's surgeon; and some saw reason to fear that the operation would prove an assassination.

The bold project of Thomas Sims (*A Model of Non-Secular Episcopacy*³⁸) calls for a subdividing of the dioceses of England so as to increase their total number of twenty-six to ninety-four, the abolition of the archiepiscopal office, and the appointment of bishops not by the crown but by diocesan synods. The bishops are to withdraw from Parliament, and are to have their incomes greatly reduced. Each bishop is to be assisted by two or three suffragans. Sims justifies his proposals by detailed evidence regarding the increase of population since the Reformation; and he anticipates a future multiplication of the episcopate to ten times the present number.

The solutions proposed by Arnold and Sims call to mind Archbishop Usher's *Reduction of Episcopacy* of 1641, which their authors may have had in mind. The Observer's reviewer naturally regards both plans as utopian. Henry Budd, an Essex rector, presents a somewhat similar proposal in *A Petition Proposed to be Presented Respectively to the Three Estates of the Legislature*, on the subject of Church reform. Mr. Budd is more cautious in his treatment of the structure of the Church's government; and he makes the most specific proposals for the education of the clergy in diocesan seminaries. The Liturgy is to be read daily or oftener if a congregation can be obtained; but reforms are to be introduced in it in order to attract dissenters.

Lord Henley's much discussed *Plan of Church Reform* (1832) is here also noticed. The plan calls for the enforcement of residence, the abolition of sinecurism, and the funding of the revenues of bishops, chapters and collegiate churches in order to release £150,000 of the annual total for the augmentation of curate's livings and relief of the poor parish clergy. It also involves the restoration of Convocation on a wider basis of representation than formerly, to consider further measures of reform.

Lord Henley's plan appeared early in the summer of 1832, and we learn from the *Quarterly Review*, which devotes forty

³⁸ pp. 160ff.

pages in December 1832 to new literature on church and state reform, that it "went through seven editions in a very short time."³⁹ The *Quarterly* scents the taint of puritanism in Henley's references to the Liturgy, regards the whole plan as "utterly impracticable," and even denies that real sinecurism exists in the Church.

6. *Defence and Revival.*

The defence against this flood of radical reform literature was not very impressive. Treatises like F. Thackeray's *Defence of the Clergy of England*, 1822, and A. Campbell's *Appeal to the Gentlemen of England on Behalf of the Clergy*, 1823, were applauded by the *Quarterly*. Among the periodicals the *British Critic* was probably the ablest and most effective advocate of the clergy. Its review of W. Dealtry's *Religious Establishments Tried by the Word of God* in October 1833,⁴⁰ approves this apologetic work, and pours indignation and scorn on the would-be reformers. At an earlier date the *Critic* had cordially welcomed to the lists of the champions of Establishments the Scot, Thomas Chalmers, whose vigorous tract *On the Use and Abuse of Literary and Ecclesiastical Endowments* surprised and heartened the wavering battalions of Anglicanism in the anxious months of 1829.⁴¹ Chalmers charged the "calculators and economists" who threatened the Church of England, with the aim of "a truly Gothic spoliation."⁴² By others the menacing secularism was thought of as not Gothic but Satanic. A humorous poem in *Blackwood's* of April 1832, at the height of the Reform Bill excitement, depicts Satan as a charming and fashionable radical who "prates of parsons, bishops and tithes."⁴³

Parliament was so largely occupied with Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill that apart from the Irish Church Bill none of the church reform plans actually became a Parliamentary issue. Fear of the Roman Catholic influence led the clergy in general to oppose the Catholic Relief measure from its first appearance before the House in 1805 to its enactment in 1829. Fear of Rome prevailed also even among some supporters of the measure. Sydney Smith, who brilliantly cham-

³⁹ *Quarterly Review*, XLVIII (1832), pp. 560ff.

⁴⁰ *British Critic*, XIV, 394ff.

⁴¹ Chalmers, although in 1843 he felt bound to lead the Disruptionists in Scotland, remained devoted to the principle of an established church.

⁴² *British Critic*, 3rd Series, VII, (1830), p. 315.

⁴³ *Blackwood's*, XXXI. pp. 392ff.

pioned the Bill, used the argument "My cry then is *no popery*: therefore emancipate the Catholics, that they may not join with foreign papists in time of war."⁴⁴ On the eve of Catholic Emancipation, *Blackwood's* summoned the Established Church to the defence of its religion from a rising "savage religious despotism."⁴⁵ When Wellington and the Tories espoused the Roman Catholic cause, the old line Anglicans were in a panic. The part played by this fear in the inception of Tractarianism is second only to that of the reaction to parliamentary reform.

All thoughtful men were coming to realize the pressure of the church problem. They might justly discount heavily for exaggeration the anti-clerical propaganda; but they were nevertheless persuaded that the Establishment was in a pitiable plight. A writer in *Blackwood's* in 1829 reports a remark that the Church, formerly prosperous, "gave not God the glory and was eaten of worms."⁴⁶ And in 1830 an article in that journal⁴⁷ sadly confesses that whereas "thirty or forty years ago she was enthusiastically supported by the body of the English population," now "to defend the church is to provoke popular derision."

There were some who hoped and some who feared that the last end of the Church of England by law established, was at hand. But churches rarely die, and more than a spark of life still remained. Indeed, the lethargic body was really beginning to exhibit fresh animation. Six million pounds had been spent between 1818, when the Church Building Society was founded, and 1833,⁴⁸ on the building and restoring of churches. Despite the much criticized system of pew-rents this movement went some distance toward providing church accommodation for the working masses. A great advance in the church-directed education of children was in progress. Piety was still being cultivated by means of countless manuals of private devotion and discipline, and by a considerable amount of evangelical preaching. All of these subjects would require exploration in any full picture of Anglicanism on the eve of the Oxford Revival.

We should further consider the anticipations of Tractarianism that appear in the correspondence of John Jebb and Alexander Knox, in the *Autobiography of Isaac Williams*, and in

⁴⁴ *Works of the Reverend Sydney Smith*, Boston, 1857, p. 437.

⁴⁵ *Blackwood's*, XXIV (1828), pp. 404-440.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, XXV (1829), p. 617.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, XXVIII (1830), pp. 794-811.

⁴⁸ Cornish, F. W., *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Part I, p. 81.

William Palmer's *Narrative of Events Connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times*. But this field has been amply explored by Mozley, Ward, Thureau-Dangin, Brilioth and others, and cannot even be entered in this paper.

"Isaac," said Froude to Williams in the summer of 1833, "we must make a row in the world." It was in the mind of Froude that the new aggressive purpose was born. He and Keble and Newman were intent upon the deliverance of the Church of England from the long oppression of secularism. Keble saw "national apostasy" in the Irish Church Act, because it seemed to assert as an unquestioned principle the right of Parliament to reorder the church at will. The Tractarians were aware that what was first needed was a revival rather than a reform—a revival very different from that called "the Evangelical"—the creation of a new sense of the reality of corporate religion, and an assertion of the dignity and authority of the Church. They went far backward in order to go forward—back to the Caroline divines, back beyond the Tudor Reformation, back to the "Undivided Church." They were girded for war, and valiantly they waged it. If their sympathies appear at times discredibly narrow, we should remember that they were not philosophers but crusaders.

THE CONCEPTION OF AUTHORITY IN THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

By T. L. HARRIS, *Philadelphia, Pa.*

In the past, church historians have too often neglected the influence of social forces on the development of theological ideas. I propose therefore to study the Tractarians' conception of authority with reference to their social environment rather than with reference to their theological heredity.

First of all it is important to remember the Tractarians were by no means insulated from the current of the times. Pusey was closely related by birth to one of the powerful families of the English aristocracy. Newman, as Fellow of Oriel, daily dined with a man who had fought in the Peninsula and with Blanco White, a Spanish ex-priest, and had as a young don very frequent intercourse with the ablest men of his time.¹ Gladstone was an intimate friend of the Tractarian leaders. And Oxford was an important centre not only culturally but politically. Nothing could be further from the truth than to suppose that the Oxford Movement was uninfluenced by the major tendencies of the times. By hearsay, by reading, by conversation and by action the Tractarians were fully aware of what was occurring in England at the time. The Oxford Movement was indeed reactionary but it was not the reaction of cloistered scholars aloof from the doings of the contemporary world. Keble indeed did bury himself in a country parsonage but the other leaders, Newman especially, were intensely interested in the contemporary scene and close observers and critics of it.

The jibe that "the poor dears found it all in books" completely ignores the essential for the superficial. Superficially the Tractarians owe much to classical theologians for their views on authority; essentially, however, they were attempting to meet a contemporary problem and to meet it in a modern fashion.

It would not be difficult to itemize the debt of the Tractarians to their predecessors for their notion of ecclesiastical

¹ For a very important example read *The Correspondence of Cardinal Newman with Wm. Froude*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1934.

authority. They borrowed wholesale from the Anglican divines, ransacked the Fathers, and the bolder spirits did not disdain to use the scholastics. Look at Newman and you will find in his early works many references to Hammond, Bull, Hooker, and others. Wade through Pusey and the only keen thoughts vividly expressed are to be found in his voluminous quotations from the Fathers. Struggle through Ward's *Ideal* and you will find that his arguments are pointed by the scholastics. There is no doubt what arsenals they pillaged; what is much more interesting and much more significant is to discover why they needed such weapons at all and what was the contemporary enemy whose attacks they sought to rebuff.

There is therefore no apology needed for treating of the Tractarian concept of authority in its sociological setting.

First of all why was the question of authority ever raised by the Tractarians? The significance of this question escapes us unless we recall what it meant to be a clerk in holy orders a century ago. The rector of a country parish never bothered about the question of authority because he was in an almost impregnable position of authority. He was not only a gentleman and scholar but *the* gentleman and scholar in a community where both were respected. His wrath might be stirred by the squalid sluttiness of a dissenting conventicle but Dissent was socially and intellectually contemptible, though politically it was unfortunately growing in power. As for Rome, no true Englishman bothered his head about the pope; popery was an outlet for angry emotions. At the turn of the century the only dangerous foe to Anglicanism was Deism and the revolutionary free thinking associated with it. But the country parson was not seriously threatened even by these. For him the question of authority was therefore purely academic. The Prayer Book was the law of the land, the Establishment was part of the English constitution, the Protestant succession had, thank God, guaranteed the proper exercise of the royal supremacy. The country parson never worried over ecclesiastical authority because he never heard it mentioned.

But the question was destined to be raised by the process of social and political change. In France, Voltaire had attacked church privilege with merciless satire. His followers in England imitated him less successfully. Still for the most part such troublesome fellows made little impression upon the complacency

of the country parson. More serious was the growth of the dissenting interest consequent upon the rise of Methodism along with the industrial revolution. Non-conformists, once merely tolerated, now dared to protest at the payment of church rates. Worse still, Parliament could no longer be counted on as the champion of the church. Dissenters already held seats in that body and the agitation for Catholic emancipation threatened still more disastrously the alliance of church and state. Erastianism was all very well so long as it favoured the church but quite another tune must be sung if the Parliament were to infringe church privileges or tamper with the Prayer Book.

But this was precisely what the government was proposing to do. A strong demonstration of revolutionary sentiment had forced the passage of the Reform Bill in 1833; plainly the next objective was to bring the Establishment into close harmony with the times.

To this end Arnold, the utilitarians, and the Non-conformists all pressed. Arnold, because he sincerely desired the reformation of the church and despaired of securing it except through parliamentary action; Mill and his friends, because in the spirit of the Revolution they detested church privilege and were thoroughly secularist in spirit; the Non-conformists because they had a natural reluctance to supporting an institution which they disapproved and had reason to fear, and which also represented the landed interest as against the merchant and manufacturer now rising into power on the crest of the Industrial Revolution. When the parliament was friendly to the church, the clergy were naturally Erastian; but when Parliament threatened the church, the clergy had to find some other basis for their position and influence than that conferred by social custom and the royal supremacy.

This is precisely the point that Newman made in the *Tracts for the Times*, and that it was effective is attested by the solid support which the Tractarians received in the beginning of the Oxford Movement from the country clergy, the universities, and the legal profession. The truth is the counter-revolution in England crystallized around the church because the country clergy represented the landed interest. The history of the Oxford Movement is an important chapter in the history of the counter-revolution in England. The ideas which the Tractarians advocated were designed as an antidote for the poison of

Rousseau and Voltaire. Like many antidotes, it had close affinities with the poison for which it was a remedy. Both the Revolution and the counter-revolution were thoroughly Romantic.

The question of authority was first raised under the threat of a hostile Parliament. William Palmer had none of Newman's keen insight into the working of intellectual and social forces; Palmer represents the point of view of a learned but unimaginative person. His testimony is therefore peculiarly valuable. I quote the following passages from his *Narrative*: "We all contemplated with the deepest alarm the general abuse of principles which led to the inundation of the press by publications recommending the most vital alterations in the Prayer Book and of our whole system, merely by the authority of Parliament. . . ." ² "We knew not to what quarter to look for support. A Prelacy threatened, and apparently intimidated; a Government making its powers subservient to agitators who avowedly sought the destruction of the Church. The State so long the guardian of the Church, now becoming its enemy and tyrant. And what was worst of all—no principle in the public mind to which we could appeal; an utter ignorance of all rational grounds of attachment to the Church; an oblivion of its spiritual character, as an institution, not of man but of God; the grossest Erastianism most widely prevalent amongst all classes of politicians." ³

Newman puts matters more tersely. The Tractarians' "idea or first principle was ecclesiastical liberty; the doctrine which it especially opposed was, in ecclesiastical language, the heresy of Erastus, and in political, the Royal Supremacy. The object of its attack was the Establishment considered simply as such." ⁴ In private correspondence with his friend Bowden (August 31, 1833), Newman faced disestablishment and disendowment with equanimity and in the first *Tract for the Times* he raised the real issue. "Should the Government and the Country so far forget their God as to cast off the Church, to deprive it of its temporal honours and substance, on what will you rest the claim of respect and attention which you make upon your flocks? Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, your education, your wealth, your connections; should these secular

² William Palmer, *Narrative*, p. 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁴ Newman, *Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*, Vol. I, p. 101.

advantages cease, on what must Christ's Ministers depend?" Undoubtedly it was a serious question. It was the question of authority raised in its most practical form and Newman gave an answer which he soon discovered was too pragmatic; he writes in the same *Tract*: "I fear we have neglected our real ground on which our authority is built—OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT—. . . The Lord Jesus Christ gave His spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops."⁵ The question of authority sprang out of an Erastian challenge; it was met by an ill-considered but effective appeal to the apostolic succession.

But the battle once joined, the conflict refused to be confined to its original seat. Most of the clergy and many of the laity were perfectly willing to appeal to the doctrine of the apostolic succession against the threat of parliamentary regulation of the church, but they were reluctant to accept the consequence of such an appeal. Newman was quick enough to see that the dispute was really between the spirit of liberalism which motivated an Erastian Parliament and another spirit which he soon identified with Catholicism.

Principal Fairbairn fairly summarises the position of Newman and his followers in this paragraph:

"To these men, then, the progress of events in literature and philosophy on the one hand, and in Church and State on the other, combined to set the problem: How can the Church be rescued from the hands of a State penetrated and commanded by 'Liberalism,' and be elevated into an authority able to regulate faith and conscience, to contrast reason and society? What Newman named 'Liberalism' was a single force disguised in many forms, rationalism in religion, revolution or reform in politics, Erastianism and latitudinarianism in church. It was the spirit of change, negation, disintegration and destruction. . . . To save the church, two things were necessary—to invest it with divine authority and all rights flowing from it; and to set it strong in its authority and rights over against the apostate State on the one hand, and the rebellious reason on the other."⁶

The two aspects of liberalism which the Newmanites most feared were intellectual and moral, though they refused to admit any absolute severance between these aspects. Newman was

⁵ *Tracts for the Times*, No. I.

⁶ Fairbairn, A. M., *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican*, p. 113.

thoroughly sceptical of reason and constantly insisted upon the need of an external authority to guide, direct, and establish it. He also feared with some justification that "the Liberal and the Libertine were close cousins." Wilfred Ward says of his father: "A deep cry" he writes, "is heard from human nature, 'Teach us the truth for we cannot find it ourselves, yet we need it more than ought else on earth.'" Again and again he quoted Carlyle's saying, "True guidance in return for loving obedience, did he but know it, is man's prime need." The Tractarians longed for an authority which should be a defence against liberalism in thought and in morals. They sought for it in the authority of the church.

But there was a third reason why the question of authority should have been so pressing, although it is only occasionally alluded to—chiefly in the *Tracts* and in correspondence; this third reason was the growth of Dissent. When Newman was born, Methodism had scarcely broken from Anglicanism; it was still fashionable to dismiss it with a sneer as "enthusiasm"; but as the middle classes gained in political and social importance, and as the neglected dwellers in the slums were won over to Methodism, the parson was called upon to justify his position and to establish his own authority and the authority of his church. Why should not a good Protestant leave the dull formality of the parish church for the fervor of a chapel? On Protestant grounds there was no reason, on patriotic grounds no reason now that Dissent was given full legal status. Thus inevitably the parson came to question the Protestant doctrine when it so readily justified absence from his congregation.

The question of authority grew naturally out of changing political and social conditions. It was precipitated by an Erastian attack on the privileges of Anglicanism, it was fostered by the increasing importance of the Dissent, but its chief and most significant cause was the spirit of liberalism which questioned all established authority and forced it to become vocal and apologetic.

We now come to the second main question. Why, when the question of authority was raised, could it not be settled by an old formula, for the question itself was not new.

The Erastians—and most churchmen were Erastian—thought the whole matter was settled by Act of Parliament.

⁷ W. G. Ward, *The Oxford Movement*, p. 73.

The Prayer Book was a mere schedule to the Act of Uniformity, the Thirty-nine Articles had a legal status, the Established church was but the nation's department of religion. An Englishman can be devout and also an Erastian, a feat which is almost impossible for more logical minds. Remember that in the English constitution (if there be such a thing) the question of authority is exceedingly obscure. The king can do no wrong, but Charles I was beheaded and James II exiled; the law of the land is majestic, but if inconvenient the judges can interpret it or the people ignore it. Englishmen seem to shun fundamental issues; their Erastianism was and is more practical than theoretical. The first answer any Anglican would give to the question of authority would be to point vaguely at Parliament and legal precedents, but the mere fact that he gives an Erastian answer to the question of authority does not in the least mean that he accepts its consequences. His political, legal, and ecclesiastical tradition opposes any exact definition of authority. It was no difficult task for the Tractarians to make Erastianism ridiculous to all except a very few.

Driven from the obvious Erastian answer, Englishmen a century ago promptly declared that the Bible was the authority in matters of religion. They gave the traditional Protestant answer, but were soon embarrassed to discover that the Anglican church never accepted it. Even Hook's ingenious phrase, "The Church to teach, the Bible to prove," could not long conceal the consequence that the church was then the authority—but what was meant by the church? This the Tractarians attempted to explain and to expound.

The most radical solution of the problem of authority, indeed the logical conclusion of Protestantism, was that reason is the sole authority. Now the Tractarians could not accept this answer, first because, as Newman saw, reason leads to scepticism, and secondly because the absolute supremacy of reason means atomic individualism. And the Tractarians feared both scepticism and individualism.

Obviously the Tractarians must propose either a new answer or a refinement of the old ones. The main current of the times was toward setting the individual up as his own authority in every department of life. Romanticism, nationalism, liberalism, and the new industrialism all pointed in the same direction. The Tractarians were feeling after some counter-current

and indeed were moved by many of those eddies which ran counter—to the revolution.

What answer did the Tractarians give to the question of authority? They began with the unanimous answer, "our apostolical descent"; they ended in hopeless divergence. Remember that these clergymen repeated constantly the clause in the creed, "I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," and that they were learned enough to know what those words meant and honest enough to believe the words they repeated. The fatal divergence was between those who emphasized the epithet "apostolic" and those who emphasized "catholic." After the first few months the rift was revealed.

All Tractarians began by claiming ecclesiastical authority on the grounds of their apostolic descent. It is well to observe that "in one point their doctrine on succession definitely diverges from the primitive one: In the primitive Church it was the claim of holders of the same Bishop's throne, which had to be maintained (against Gnosticism)," . . . while Neo-Anglicanism seeks the connection between consecrators and consecrated."⁸ The Tractarians sought such a connection because political and social events were impelling them to find a basis of authority for their ministry. Conservatives like Palmer scarcely ventured beyond a simple claim to apostolic succession that was their guarantee for apostolicity—and for them apostolic and catholic were almost interchangeable terms.

When Newman laid stress upon apostolic succession, he carried it to its logical conclusion. Unlike his successors, Newman was absolutely obedient to his bishop. In writing to his friend Bowden, August 17, 1838, Newman remarks: "What he said was very slight indeed, but a Bishop's lightest word, *ex cathedra*, is heavy." And in his *Essay on the Catholicity of the English Church* he plainly states: "Considered as bishop, each is the ultimate centre of unity and independent channel of grace; they are all equal."⁹ Newman was driven from this position first because the bishops declared against him, and secondly because this parochialism violated his sense of catholicity. He soon saw that such a view was really untenable.

Pusey was a learned man with all the muddle-headedness popularly attributed to professors. Years after Newman sub-

⁸ Brilioth, Y. T., *The Anglican Revival*, p. 186.

⁹ *Essays Critical and Historical*, Vol. II, p. 23.

mitted to Rome, Pusey wrote: "I am not disturbed, because I never attached any weight to the Bishops. It was perhaps the difference between Newman and me; he threw himself upon the Bishops, and they failed him; I throw myself on the English Church and the Fathers as, under God, her support." What Pusey meant by the English church it is not easy to say; certainly he did not mean "the Protestant religion as in this land by Law established."

Pusey looked for the church's authority to be expressed not by individual bishops but by canon and council—and as a very learned man he had little difficulty in discovering what he intended to find. As Fairbairn tartly remarks of the Puseyites, "Their supreme difficulty, which broke down the transcendent genius of the party, was to get their own church to speak their mind; and they were even less successful with the Fathers than with their church."¹⁰ It was all very well to talk of apostolicity, but what were the limits of antiquity? Until 1054, or the first five or six centuries? The seventh ecumenical council? Newman frankly says, "Now I cannot make out in what sense the Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, or Chalcedon are true councils, in which that of Trent is not a true council also. I seem to feel I must either go on to Trent or stop short of Nicea."¹¹ All the world knows that Newman went on to Trent because he emphasized catholicity rather than apostolicity.

In his *Essay on the Catholicity of the English Church* which Newman composed to heal the smart inflicted by Wiseman's article, he cleverly states the conflict in a dialogue between an Anglican and a Roman.

Anglican: We go by Antiquity; that is the Apostles. Ancient consent is our standard of faith."

Roman: We go by Catholicity. Universal consent is our standard of faith.

Anglican: You are cut off from the old Fathers.

Roman: And you are cut off from the present living Church. In commenting on this passage after his conversion, Newman reveals an important temperamental divergence among the Tractarians. "Our starting point," he writes, "is not the fact of a faithful transmission of Orders, but the standing fact of the Church, the Visible and One Church, the reproduction and

¹⁰ Fairbairn, A. M., *op. cit.*, p. 311.

¹¹ *Correspondence of J. H. Newman and Keble*, published by the Oratory, p. 21.

succession of herself age after age. . . . It is the great Note of a never-ending *coetus fidelium* with a fixed organization, a unity of jurisdiction, a political greatness, a continuity of existence in all places and times, a suitableness to all classes, ranks, and callings, an ever-energizing life, an untiring, ever-evolving history, which is her evidence that she is the creation of God." Newman was an imperialist as truly as Disraeli, only in an ecclesiastical dress. Newman was looking for a Catholic, an imperial authority—he found it naturally in Rome.

But in the course of this search he stumbled upon another notion of authority, and the discovery which he never himself used is now employed by the modernistic descendants of the Tractarians. "Authority" by them is shorn of its legalistic metaphors and expressed in almost biological terms.¹² Newman anticipates them more than once when he insists that life is an essential note of the church and perhaps the first warrant of her authority.

We find then that the Tractarian conception of authority was variegated. Did it lie in the apostolic succession and the bishop? or in apostolicity vouched for by canon and council and antiquity? or in the *coetus fidelium* with a fixed organization, a unity of jurisdiction, a political greatness? or did it lie in its organic power to produce the life of holiness? This last supposition was barely hinted at. If Newman had known modern biology, his brilliant imagination would perhaps have led him to develop further lines of thought which in the *Essay on Development* are blocked by a too legalistic and historical a position.

I need do scarcely more than mention the difficulties involved in these various answers to the problem of authority.

An appeal to apostolic succession led to false history, bad theology, and poor strategy. It was good tactics to appeal to "our apostolical descent," but in the long run bad strategy, for it fossilized the sacramental idea of the church in a static view of the church, which depended upon a thoroughly erroneous interpretation of the history of the primitive church. The appeal to apostolic succession was a frontal attack upon the Protestant churches; a flank attack with the battle cry of catholicity might have won the day.¹³

As to the appeal of antiquity, that was simply the pedant's

¹² See *Essays Catholic and Critical*, and Boulgakoff, S., *L'Orthodoxie*.

¹³ Fairbairn, A. M., *op. cit.*, pp. 19-20.

snobbish enjoyment of his right of private judgment; as Newman caustically remarked in his lectures on *Difficulties felt by Anglicans*, "In some points you prefer Rome, in others Greece, in others England, in others Scotland, and of that preference your own private judgment is the ultimate sanction."¹⁴ The curious result of the Tractarians' insistence upon ecclesiastical authority has been widespread ecclesiastical anarchy. I doubt whether one could find two parish churches in England where the ritual or even the doctrine is the same at all points. Every parish priest does what is right in his own eyes and pleads for his eccentricities the authority of the Catholic church.

But the situation is not quite as ludicrous as it may appear; the emphasis on authority and the inability to define it are both legacies of the Oxford Movement—and finally of the Revolution and counter-revolution a century and more ago.

As against the totalitarian view of the state, the Tractarians entered an effective, and I personally believe a most necessary protest, by exalting the authority of the church. As against the romantic deification of the individual's capacity for reason, the Tractarians entered an effective and necessary protest. The assumption that any fool is competent to judge for himself in matters of politics and religion may be good Protestantism and good democracy but it is dangerous nonsense. The Tractarians emphasized the authority of the society in matters of religion, as others today are emphasizing the authority of the state in matters of politics.

Certainly at these two points the Tractarians ran counter to the dominant trend of their times but in other respects their view on authority derived force from the set and drift of the nineteenth century. Their insistence upon "apostolicity" has real affinities with the 'historismus' which is so curiously characteristic of the epoch now closing. The nineteenth century was always prone to judge things by their roots. Again the Tractarians' penchant for catholicity in ecclesiastical areas was an expression of the same forces which led towards imperialism in the political area.

At every point, I believe, investigation would show that the Tractarian concepts of ecclesiastical authority were influenced by and directed towards the political, social, intellectual, and economic situation of the society in which they lived.

¹⁴ Newman, *Difficulties Felt by Anglicans*, Vol. I, pp. 160-161.

RECENT RECOGNITION OF ARCHBISHOP PECKHAM—BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

JOHN L. PECKHAM

Yale University

Since the opening of the century there has been a marked awakening of interest in the works of John Peckham and an increasing appreciation of his importance in many areas of medieval life and thought. As lecturer at Paris and Rome, as Provincial Minister of the Franciscans in England, and as Archbishop of Canterbury, this active and learned scholar devoted his attention to many literary and executive tasks, making substantial contributions in such varied fields as theology, philosophy, religious education, homiletics, canon law, Franciscan history, science, liturgics, and poetry.

Until quite recent years, little work was attempted in connection with Peckham save the editing of parts of his Lambeth register¹ and an account of his life and works for the *Dictionary of National Biography*.² E. L. Cutts recognized the importance of canon x of Peckham's Lambeth Council (1281) and printed it in English in his *Parish Priests and their People*³; but, with few exceptions⁴, other writers accorded to Peckham only casual mention, and he remained comparatively unnoticed in the nineteenth century. It seems possible that in England only Prof. A. G. Little⁵ perceived the real importance of the Friar; and Professor Little's more significant work on Peckham was to come after the turn of the century. But among German scholars a seed had been sown which later grew to impressive proportions, for the learned Father (later Cardinal) Franz Ehrle, S. J., had published two studies⁶ which were to be used by Spettmann, Little, and others in the following century.

1 By C. T. Martin for the *Rolls Series* (1882-5). Reviewed by T. F. Tout in *English Historical Review*, II (1887), 555-9.

2 By C. L. Kingsford (sometime before 1895).

3 London, 1898.

4 Notably Jeremy Collier and R. W. Dixon.

5 *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxford, 1892), especially pp. 73-7 and 154-6.

6 "Der Augustinismus und der Aristotelismus in der Scholastik gegen Ende des XIII Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, V (1889), 603f; and "John Peckham über den Kampf des Augustinismus," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, XIII (1889), 172-93."

I. THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

Perhaps the most diligent work upon Peckham has been done by P. Hieronymus Spettmann, O. F. M., who has produced an impressive series of studies exhibiting scholarly research and enviable competence. The series begins with "Quellen-kritisches zur Biographie des Johannes Pecham,"⁷ which traces references to Peckham in various sources down to the sixteenth century, including a manuscript, *circa* 1461, in which the learned Friar is listed as *Doctor Ingeniosus* (p. 198f). Spettmann rejects the spelling "Peckham" (as does Professor Little) but accepts such variants as Betson, Picciano, and Pitzanus (p. 170). There is an exhaustive study of source-materials within the Franciscan Order, followed by an equally careful search through materials outside the Order—monastic chronicles, "catalogues of famous men," etc. The combined data thus assembled enable the writer to construct a completely documented biography of Peckham (p. 283f) of permanent value.

Three years later, Spettmann brought out "Johannis Pechami Quaestiones tractantes de anima,"⁸ hitherto available only in manuscripts preserved in Florentine libraries. When it is noted that these texts, when printed, cover approximately 217 pages, it will readily be seen what a distinct service Spettmann has rendered⁹. The extent of the range of Peckham's own reading now becomes evident from the index of authors cited by him, given by Spettmann at the end of his study and covering three pages. The wide ramifications of the Friar's work are clear also from the bibliography¹⁰ compiled by the editor. The importance of these *Quaestiones* for an understanding of Peckham's views becomes apparent in Spettmann's next work.

The following year, Spettmann published "Die Psychologie des Johannes Pecham,"¹¹ a carefully documented study which, with the preceding one, was later to be used by others on the Continent, in England, and in America. Despite the title, which to modern ears might suggest classification under "sci-

7 *Franziskanische Studien*, II (1915), 170-207 and 266-85.

8 *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, XIX (1918), Hft. 5-6.

9 Some of the difficulties involved in editing these manuscripts are mentioned, p. xxxv *et seqq.* (*Prolegomena*) and seem quite formidable.

10 Spettmann later added further titles to this bibliography; see *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, suppl. Bd. 2 (1923), 241f.

11 *Beiträge*, etc., XX (1919), Hft. 6.

ence," this work belongs in the "theology-philosophy" group, as may be seen from the following outline of its contents:—

- I. The nature of the soul: Platonic-Augustinian elements; its composition of Matter and Form (pp. 5-19);
- II. Its relation to the body: Aristotelian elements; the *forma corporeitatis* (pp. 19-29);
- III. Inter-relation of body and soul: the Plurality-Theory; hierarchy of forms; the seat of the soul; its special organs (pp. 29-47);
- IV. Potencies of the soul: concept of potencies; their number; the *anima vegetativa, sensitiva, and rationale*; the intellect; the rational will; relation of the potencies to "soul-substance" and to each other (pp. 47-69);
- V. The origin of the soul: the *rationes seminales*¹², etc. (pp. 69-83);
- VI. The continuance of the soul after death (pp. 83-97).

It may be of interest to note that Spettmann calls attention¹³ to Mandonnet's inaccuracy in characterizing the whole Franciscan School as "Augustinian," observing that both de Wulf and Ehrle had avoided this mistake. We are indebted to Spettmann for a fourth study, "Die Ethikkommentar des Johannes Pecham,"¹⁴ i. e., his "Scriptum super Ethicam," found in Florence, Bibl. Naz. MS. Conv. Sopp. (S. Croce) G. 4. 853. Spettmann discusses the script, authorship, provenance, and construction; he calls attention to Peckham's division of ethics into two sections—happiness and virtue—and then discusses the sources and authorities cited. More recently, two other studies¹⁵ have come from Spettmann's pen, "Der Sentenzenkommentar des Franziskanerbischofs Johannes Pecham"¹⁶ and "Pechams Kommentar zum vierten Buche der Sentenzen."¹⁷

P. Livarius Oliger, O. F. M., has also played a leading part in bringing Peckham to a position of prominence through several publications of his own and by reviews of studies by others. He has rendered available a substantial piece of Peckham's work in his "De pueris oblatis in ordine Minorum (cum textu hucusque inedito Fr. Johannis Pecham)"¹⁸; and he has discussed

¹² Discussed also by Sharp (*infra*), pp. 61, 123, 179, 289f and 372; and also by Vogel (*infra*), p. 7.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 9, note 2.

¹⁴ *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, suppl. Bd. 2 (1923), 221-42.

¹⁵ Not available to the reviewer.

¹⁶ *Divus Thomas*, (Fribourg), v. (1927), 327-45.

¹⁷ *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, LII (1928), 64-74.

¹⁸ *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, VIII (1915), Hft. 3-4, 398-447. This has been reviewed by P. Hieronymus Spettmann, O. F. M., in *Franziskanische Studien*, IV (1917), 217f.

what was once a burning issue among the Franciscans in "Die theologische Quaestion des Johannes Pecham über die vollkommene Armut,"¹⁹ in which he published Peckham's "De perfectione evangelica"²⁰ as found in the Florentine Bibl. Naz. MS. Conv. Sopp. J. 1. 3, fol. 54^r and ff. (pp. 139-76).

P. Mandonnet²¹ has given a detailed discussion of Peckham's conflict with the Unitary Theory of the substantial form in man²² and with Aristotelianism in general, giving an interpretation of his own to the contest between Peckham and Aquinas²³. He also shows that both Peckham and Bonaventura had composed refutations of William of St. Amour²⁴, citing MS. evidence; and he has utilized Peckham's *Registrum* to prove²⁵ that Siger de Brabant and Boethius of Dacia concluded their last days "wretchedly in some transalpine locality."²⁶

An article by André Callebaut, "Jean Pecham, O. F. M., et L'Augustinisme"²⁷ merits careful study. Peckham's importance is definitely recognized: "*Comme par enchantement, le Franciscain Pecham devint le héros légendaire de l'histoire de la scolastique du XIII^e siècle, en conduisant à l'assaut l'Augustinisme*" (p. 443). There is a discussion of the value of the sources for the reconstruction of the details of this assault, Callebaut finding Dominican bias in the account left by Bartholomew of Capua. He addresses himself in detail to the relevant passages in Peckham's *Registrum*, and gives additional references to a Peckham manuscript at Florence, Bibl. Lauren. MS. Conv. Sopp. 123 (folio 60^r).²⁸

Another careful study along this same line is by Jean Rohmer²⁹, whose discussion of "L'Unité numérique de la

19 *Franziskanische Studien*, IV (1917), 127-76.

20 Written (Oliger claims) against Gerard of Abbeville.

21 *Siger de Brabant*: part 1. (Louvain, 1911.)

22 *Op. cit.*, pp. 91-108 and 299.

23 *Ibid.*, pp. 95-102.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 91.

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 100-8 and 228-85.

26 *Registrum Epistolarum Fr. Johannis Peckham*, III, 842.

27 *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, XVIII (1925), 441-72; summarized on p. 441 (in Latin) and on pp. 471-2 (in French). Callebaut gives a reference (p. 472, note 1) to Peckham by Cardinal Ehrle in his "L'agostinismo . . .," in *Xenia thomistica* (Rome, 1925), which the reviewer has not been able to see.

28 Note the criticism of de Wulf's *Le Traité 'De unitate formae' de Gilles de Lessines* (p. 61f) occurring p. 443, note 5.

29 "La Théorie de l'Abstraction dans l'Ecole franciscaine, de Alexandre de Halès à Jean Peckham," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, III (1928), 105-84. Peckham is also mentioned on pp. 105 and 175; and there is a good summary on p. 181f.

lumière intellectuelle chez Jean Peckham" utilizes Spettmann's text.

Maurice de Wulf³⁰ has clearly recognized Peckham's importance in the contest between Augustinism and Aristotelianism³¹, but alleges that the Primate's correspondence betrays a "fiery temper and tendency to exaggerate,"³² and that the Franciscan had inveighed "passionately" against Dominican teaching³³, although his condemnations were disregarded at Paris³⁴. De Wulf intimates³⁵ that Peckham influenced Roger Bacon, but he criticizes Père Delorme's statement that Peckham (and others) accepted the ideological conclusions of Bacon³⁶.

Dr. D. E. Sharp has selected six philosophers—Robert Grosseteste, Thomas of York, Roger Bacon, John Peckham, Richard of Middleton, and Duns Scotus—for a solid study³⁷ based partly upon unedited manuscript materials. Although Peckham occupies the least pretentious position³⁸ in this work, it is significant that he has been included in this distinguished group. Here is perhaps the best treatment in English of Peckham's contribution to philosophy. After a brief account of his life, his relation to his contemporaries, and his work (including data regarding various manuscripts), Dr. Sharp treats his philosophy under the following heads: Theory of Becoming, Types of Becoming, Matter in its Static Aspect, Form in its Static Aspect, Psychology (pp. 185-203), Angelology, and Natural Theology. A similar division has been followed with the other five philosophers.

Dr. Sharp states that "the main reason for including [Peckham] in this study of Oxford philosophers is the prominence that he gives to the problem of the plurality of forms" (p. 176), a problem which is accorded a fairly lucid treatment in some detail³⁹, and which is termed "one of the greatest controversies of Peckham's day" (p. 186). It may be noted that

30 *History of Medieval Philosophy* (Translation by E. C. Messenger). London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926. The first (French) edition appeared in 1900.

31 *Op. cit.*, II, 261, 283, 335, 337, etc.

32 *Ibid.*, I, 378f.

33 *Ibid.*, II, 40-2.

34 *Ibid.*, II, 57.

35 *Ibid.*, II, 134.

36 *Ibid.*, II, 142, note 1.

37 *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford: University Press, 1930).

38 *Op. cit.*, pp. 175-207.

39 *Ibid.*, pp. 186-92.

an illuminating passage (pp. 240-4) regarding his views on Plurality of Form is included in the chapter on Richard of Middleton. Peckham receives considerable attention also in the final chapter, "Conclusion," where his enumeration of the proofs⁴⁰ of immortality is given (p. 389f). Dr. Sharp has chosen to ignore "the probably fruitful commentary on the *Ethics* . . . by reason of its debatable authorship."⁴¹

A very different kind of work is *Thomas Aquinas*⁴² by M. C. D'Arcy, S. J., inadequately documented and extreme in its language. Of the three references to Peckham, one is a trifle disparaging (p. 17), and the other two seem to reflect more animus than normally characterizes a cautious historian. "John Peckham who was a zealous Augustinian, so far forgot himself as to upbraid St. Thomas in a long and intemperate harangue"; and "John Peckham tried to bully St. Thomas in a public argument and looked back upon the encounter with satisfaction."⁴³ Neither of these statements is supported by reference to any primary source.

The new *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*⁴⁴ has devoted forty columns to "Jean Pecham" and gives full recognition to his true importance: "*Il a non seulement inauguré une époque glorieuse de l'histoire de l'Église en Grande-Bretagne, mais a aussi joué un rôle prépondérant dans les luttes aiguës . . . à l'université de Paris.*" His life, his activities—nineteen columns are devoted to his works alone—and his doctrinal position are treated with genuine ability and penetration. Reasons are given (col. 114) for believing that the "Formula confessionis" should be attributed to John Rigaldi instead of to the English Friar.

The bibliography reveals a masterful acquaintance with the literature of Peckham and is very strong on his contributions⁴⁵ to theology, philosophy, and Franciscan history; but it is not so satisfactory in the fields of religious education, homiletics, canon law, science, and poetry—a limitation doubtlessly imposed

⁴⁰ Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 193f.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 176, note 3. See Spettmann, "Der Ethikkommentar des Johannes Pecham" (*supra*); and A. Pelzer, "Les versions Latines des ouvrages de Morale conservés sous le nom d' Aristote en usage au xiii^e siècle," *Rev. Néo Scol.*, 1921, 316f.

⁴² London: E. Benn, 1930.

⁴³ *Op. cit.*, p. 47 and p. 251.

⁴⁴ Fascicule C. (Paris, 1932).

⁴⁵ Including several studies not available to the present reviewer.

by the scope of the *Dictionnaire*. It is significant that the list of "Travaux particuliers" (columns 139-40) includes 48 titles (German, French, English, Latin, Italian, and Dutch), of which 43 have appeared since 1900—convincing evidence of the recent recognition of Peckham's importance.

Somewhat less extensive bibliographical data can be found in Dr. B. Geyer's edition of *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*⁴⁶, in which Bonaventura is pictured (p. 480) as having surrounded himself with a circle of distinguished scholars, of whom Matthew of Aquasparta and John Peckham were the most important. This seems to imply that Peckham was under the immediate instruction of Bonaventura, an assumption which Lampen (*infra*) challenges on apparently good grounds.

II. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND HOMILETICS

In these not unrelated fields it is possible to note several works since 1900 which accord to Peckham an attention which seems to be increasing. As the century opened, the editors of *The Lay Folks' Catechism*⁴⁷ printed the text of Peckham's Lambeth decrees on education (canons ix-xiii) and devoted a few pages of their *Introduction* to this Archbishop of Canterbury.

A. F. Leach⁴⁸ drew upon Peckham's *Registrum* for interesting side-lights upon various thirteenth century matters:—The Archbishop employed French when writing to nuns but Latin when writing to monks (p. xviii); he appointed a Master at the Norwich School (p. 232); and he confirmed the jurisdiction of the Master of the Canterbury School in law-suits affecting the students (p. 232 and p. 256). Leach's later book, *Schools of Medieval England*⁴⁹, is scarcely more than a running comment upon these excerpts, as far as Peckham is concerned, save for the more extended account (p. 172f) of conditions at Merton College which the prelate undertook to correct.

Cardinal Gasquet has referred several times to the Franciscan prelate, once terming him "the celebrated Archbishop Peckham of Canterbury"⁵⁰; but since Dr. Coulton (*infra*) demolished

46 Zweiter Teil: *Die Patristische und Scholastische Philosophie*, (Berlin, 1928), pp. 479, 484f, 495 and 762.

47 E. E. T. S. (O. S.) 118; T. F. Simons and H. E. Nolloth, editors (London, 1901).

48 *Educational Charters and Documents* 598-1909 (Cambridge: University Press, 1911).

49 London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., n. d. (1915†)

50 *England under the Old Religion* (London, 1912), p. 233. See also his *Parish Life in Medieval England* (2nd. ed., London, 1907), *passim*.

parts of the rosy pictures painted by the Cardinal, it is doubtful if students of history will consult the works of Gasquet without considerable caution. Most of his statements about Peckham's work which seem to be of permanent value can be found elsewhere. But the Cardinal's emphasis upon Peckham may legitimately be regarded as reflecting the increasing interest in the Archbishop, even when the Cardinal's enthusiasm out-runs or misconstrues the documentary evidence.

In 1920, A. W. Parry published a well-documented study of *Education in England in the Middle Ages*⁵¹ in which he draws upon Peckham's *Registrum* (p. 107) and refers to him as one of the leading men of learning who influenced educational development through their connection with the universities (p. 187). In the same year Miss Margaret Deanesly⁵² translated (p. 184) a short excerpt from the register and made several references to the Archbishop's educational work.

Miss Ruth E. Messenger refers to the *Constitutions* of Peckham as "extremely important," and mentions four subsequent Councils which repeated them.⁵³ But she is apparently unaware of the much larger amount of ecclesiastical legislation of a similar nature still in existence; and she may be a bit optimistic with regard to the number of sermons actually preached in consequence of such constitutions.

A more recent study⁵⁴ of Peckham's *Constitutions* includes other aspects of his educational work while occupying the primatial see of Canterbury, and essays a detailed evaluation of his influence. Evidence is presented from the Primate's register, supplemented by various injunctions, constitutions, clerical manuals, sermon-collections, and some manuscript data. Documentary evidence is given to indicate the Archbishop's influence upon a long line of prelates and upon a number of clerical manuals.

In the field of Homiletics, there has appeared only one study dealing with Peckham; but it is a singularly excellent piece of work, highly acclaimed in England, Scotland, France, Germany and the United States; and it comes from a thorough-

⁵¹ London: W. B. Clive, 1920.

⁵² *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge: University Press, 1920).

⁵³ *Ethical Teachings in the Latin Hymns of Medieval England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), p. 26f.

⁵⁴ J. L. Peckham, *Archbishop Peckham as a Religious Educator*: Yale Studies in Religion Number 7—Historical Monograph. (Scottsdale, 1934).

ly competent scholar, Dr. G. R. Owst. His *Preaching in Medieval England*⁵⁵ shows Peckham's importance in the history of homiletics, stating that Peckham's *Constitutions* of 1281 were "epoch-making" (p. 8); that they "remained the basis of all future legislation on the subject [of preaching] until the Reformation"; and that his program "remains the backbone of every subsequent treatise" (p. 282). In all succeeding Latin clerical *Manuals*, "the regular Peckham outline of instruction always finds a place" (p. 296).

III. CANON LAW AND ADMINISTRATION

It is worthy of note that within the somewhat limited field of Canon Law there appeared within four years (1913-7) four studies in which Peckham's work is recognized. In the first of these, "Archbishop Peckham and Pluralities,"⁵⁶ W. T. Waugh discusses the question: How far did Peckham's constitution on pluralities (1279) contravene the Pope's decree *Ordinarii locorum*? Waugh refutes Ogle's arguments, and also shows the weakness of Lyndwood as an historian. It is an involved and technical study in Canon Law, upon the merits of which the present writer does not venture to pass a judgment.

Almost simultaneously with Waugh's article, H. W. C. Davis treated the same decree of Peckham in his "Canon Law in England";⁵⁷ and two years later A. Hamilton Thompson published the first installment of "Pluralism in the Medieval Church,"⁵⁸ a scholarly survey covering the years 451-1366. References are given (p. 47f) to Peckham's famous constitution, but Thompson is not concerned primarily with any one prelate.

In the fourth of these studies Peckham appears only incidentally as a participant in the making of ecclesiastical law. When the Cambridge Antiquarian Society brought out the *Vetus liber archidiaconi eliensis* in 1917, the editors⁵⁹ took the opportunity to state that "the book [of inventories of ornaments, pp. 29-147] was compiled in consequence of the Archbishop's [Peckham's] injunctions" (p. xxxiii), and that Peck-

55 Cambridge: University Press, 1926.

56 *English Historical Review*, XXVIII (1913), 625-35.

57 *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, XXXIV (1913), Kanonistische Abteilung III, 344-63, especially p. 358f.

58 *Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers*, XXXIII (1915-6), 35-73.

59 C. L. Feltoe and E. H. Minns.

ham's legislation should be included in that which formed the basis of the *Statuta synodalia* found in the churches whose inventories are given in this book (p. 215, note 1).

Under this heading comes also J. W. Willis-Bund's article on "Archbishop Peckham,"⁶⁰ for it shows the Primate trying to make the Canon Law supreme over both the Welsh and the English law in Wales. In England, the Archbishop sought to strengthen the jurisdiction of Canterbury and Rome by claiming original,⁶¹ as well as appellate, jurisdiction. He endeavored to exercise this original jurisdiction in Hereford and in Worcester, but both dioceses appealed to Rome. It is a carefully documented study with many references to Peckham's *Registrum*.

In addition to these studies which have dealt directly with the formation and development of Canon Law, there have appeared some others dealing with the discharge of those legal and administrative duties which devolved upon Peckham by virtue of his archiepiscopal office. These duties were prescribed in varying detail by the Canon Law, and so the following studies seem to belong with those immediately preceding, as this section seeks to represent the legal aspect of the Primate's work.

In "Archbishop Peckham and the Council of Lambeth of 1281,"⁶² Miss Hilda Johnstone has presented a new appraisal of the prelate's ability as an administrator—not a man to be intimidated even by Edward I, for he "remained unbowed . . . beneath the driving blast of royal displeasure, and posterity should credit him both with his action and its consequence" (p. 188). The essay is a scholarly investigation based upon manuscript study of the Councils at Reading (1279) and at Lambeth (1281), and shows in what ways they are confirmed by the Petitions of 1285.

Miss Rose Graham refers⁶³ to Peckham's visitation of Battle Abbey in 1283 (p. 201), following a complaint from the monks there (p. 205); his metropolitical visitation of the diocese

⁶⁰ *Transactions of the Society of Cymmrodorion* 1900-1 (London, 1902), pp. 53-86.

⁶¹ I. e., making the Court of Canterbury one of First Instance, as well as a Court of Appeal—see C. Jenkins (*infra*), pp. 92-6.

⁶² In *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout* (Manchester, 1925), pp. 171-88.

⁶³ *English Ecclesiastical Studies* (London: S. P. C. K.; New York & Toronto: Macmillan Co., 1929). There are also data (pp. 280 and 350) drawn from Peckham's *Registrum* not noted under his name in the index.

of Worcester (pp. 333-5); and his prohibition of the use of the new and shortened service just adopted by the Benedictines (p. 339).

In Miss Eileen Power's *Medieval English Nunneries*⁶⁴ Peckham's *Registrum* has been drawn upon frequently for authoritative data. Portions of it have been translated dealing with such administrative matters as the correction of an abbeſs (p. 64-5), a refusal to receive his nominee as an inmate (p. 191-2), the appointment of "treasuresses" and "coadjutresses" (p. 223-4), and of *custodes* to manage the finances (p. 230f), his "grudging consent to the *puerilia solemnities* held on Innocents' Day" (p. 312), permission to leave the nunnery on business (p. 348) or for recreation (p. 349), regulations as to conversation (p. 407-8), his appointment of "that dark room under the dorter" as the proper place to keep a quarrelsome nun (p. 581), and his prohibition of "garments of immoderate width with excessive pleats" (p. 586).

C. R. Cheney's recent survey⁶⁵ is not restricted to the British Isles, but its references to Peckham's (printed⁶⁶) *Registrum* are numerous, sixty-nine appearing on one page (p. 143) and seventeen occurring on another (p. 99). Episcopal and metropolitanical visitation of monasteries in the thirteenth century involved many legal and administrative factors connected with the method, expenses, duration, and frequency of the visitations. Peckham's register has been found useful as a source of information along these lines, and his injunctions have been accurately described as "elaborate literary exercises, rich in metaphor and Biblical allusions" (p. 96).

*Canterbury Administration*⁶⁷ by Miss I. J. Churchill is a work evincing careful attention to detail and exhaustive research—the fruit of fourteen years of preparation and labor. From the first page of the *Preface* to the column-and-a-half devoted to Pec(k)ham in the *Index*, the Archbishop occupies a position of much importance. Some brief portions of his *Registrum* hitherto unpublished, or comments upon unpublished entries, are given in the first volume, *passim*. The second

64 Cambridge: University Press, 1922. The Archbishop is referred to as "great" (p. 26), "energetic" (p. 347), "the stern ('vigorous,' p. 346) reformer" (p. 60), and "strict disciplinarian" (p. 192. Cf. pp. 312 and 358).

65 *Episcopal Visitation of Monasteries in the Thirteenth Century* (Manchester: University Press, 1931).

66 Little or no use is made of materials existing only in manuscripts.

67 London: S. P. C. K., 1933.

volume contains transcriptions of several more extended passages.⁶⁸ His provincial council of 1283 is regarded as "a landmark in the development of the constitution" of such assemblies and still the norm in the Province of Canterbury (I, 363-4). The more significant parts of this work (as regards Peckham) are the sections on his Metropolitan Visitations (I, 295-304); on the Court of Canterbury (I, 427-30 and 460-9: "Tutorial Appeal"); and on his Court of Audience (I, 470-5 and 480-3).

Mention might be made also of the study by D. Sutcliffe, "The Financial Condition of the See of Canterbury 1279-1292," listed in the proposed contents of the projected volume of *Essays in Medieval Civilization Supplementary to Speculum*,⁶⁹ as the period covered is the primacy of Peckham.

IV. FRANCISCAN HISTORY

In this field, first place may well be given to the works of Prof. A. G. Little, who has made available three of Peckham's substantial treatises⁷⁰ with careful and critical editing. This volume, produced in collaboration with C. L. Kingsford and F. Tocco, constituted a signal recognition of Peckham's importance. It was followed shortly by *Collectanea Franciscana I*,⁷¹ which contained Dr. Little's "Description of a Franciscan Manuscript formerly in the Phillips Library" with references to Friar John's works on the Rules of St. Francis⁷² and the "Canticum pauperis."⁷³ Some of Peckham's *Quodlibeta* would seem to be included in a manuscript now in the Vatican Library.⁷⁴

In 1916, Professor Little delivered the Ford Lectures at the University of Oxford, published later as *Studies in English Franciscan History*.⁷⁵ In them Peckham is mentioned frequently; translations from his *Tractatus tres* are given;⁷⁶ and two

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.*, II, 13, 17, 31, 81f, 123, 131, and 205.

⁶⁹ Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America, not yet published.

⁷⁰ *Fratri Johannis Pecham. . . . Tractatus tres de paupertate* (British Society of Franciscan Studies, II; Aberdeen, 1910.) An excellent review of this work by P. Livarius Oligier appeared in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, IV (1911), 147-52.

⁷¹ A. G. Little, M. R. James, and H. M. Bannister, editors. (British Society of Franciscan Studies, V; Aberdeen, 1914.)

⁷² *Op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

⁷⁵ Manchester: University Press, 1917.

⁷⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 39, 53, 57, 68 and 131.

references are made to the unpublished *Formula confessionum*.⁷⁷ A later work by Professor Little, *Guide to Franciscan Studies*,⁷⁸ mentions Peckham's *Registrum*, the *Tractatus tres*, and certain poems by Peckham as significant sources.

Still another piece of work by Professor Little, "The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century,"⁷⁹ has appeared more recently and exhibits much careful research. Like Mandonnet, Mr. Little calls attention⁸⁰ to the fact that Peckham's account (*Registrum*, III, 866 and 899) of his contact with Thomas Aquinas differs materially from the report left by a witness at the process of canonization of the Dominican.

Charles Cotton in his *Grey Friars of Canterbury*⁸¹ makes several references⁸² to Peckham, only two of which, however, are taken directly from the Primate's *Registrum*, viz.: his directions to the clergy to call in Friars to assist them, and his statements that the Mendicants have power to hear confessions and grant absolution, and that they are generally more learned and more saintly than the seculars.

Friar John finds a place also in Edward Hutton's book⁸³ *The Franciscans in England, 1224-1538*, wherein we see the Friar-Archbishop writing to the Abbot of Reading on behalf of the Franciscans,⁸⁴ and attacking the Thomist doctrine of Unity of Form (p. 154). The Franciscan's heart was finally buried in the Grey Friars' church in London, where the tombs "must have been as famous as those of Westminster Abbey" (p. 170).

Passing mention might also be made of Anscar Zawart's reference work, *The History of Franciscan Preaching and of Franciscan Preachers (1209-1927)*, a "bio-bibliographical" study⁸⁵ which lists two sets of Peckham's unprinted sermons. Miss Margaret Deanesly has mentioned Peckham as among the leading Franciscan scholars of his age,⁸⁶ and as one who ac-

77 *Ibid.*, pp. 121 and 173.

78 London: S. P. C. K.; and New York: Macmillan, 1920.

79 *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, XIX (1926), 803-74.

80 *Ibid.*, p. 853. References are given to Denifle *et al.*

81 Manchester: University Press, 1924.

82 *Op. cit.*, pp. 32, 33, 38 and 76.

83 London: Constable & Co., Ltd. (1926).

84 *Op. cit.*, p. 67 (with two references to Peckham's *Registrum*). Twice later (p. 80—two more references to the *Registrum*—and p. 85) he is quoted in defense of the Franciscans.

85 *Franciscan Studies* Number 7. (New York, 1928).

86 *A History of the Medieval Church* (London, Second edition, 1928), p. 162. Cf. also C. R. S. Harris, *Duns Scotus* (Oxford, 1927), I, 83, 116 and 119.

cused Thomas Aquinas of Averrhoism.⁸⁷ Miss Vida Scudder's well documented work, *The Franciscan Adventure*⁸⁸ accords to Friar John a position of importance among early Franciscans and gives appreciative attention to his poetry (pp. 155, 173 and 289). P. Gratien in his intensive study, *Histoire de la Fondation & de l'Évolution de l'Ordre des Frères Mineurs au XIII^e siècle*,⁸⁹ indicates Peckham's place in the thorny discussion regarding evangelical poverty within the Franciscan Order, and gives an extensive bibliography (p. 256f.). He also describes the work of (St) Bonaventura and terms Peckham "*le plus célèbre de ses disciples*," adding a brief account of some of the latter's poems (p. 319f). Peckham's "*Canticum pauperis pro dilecto*"⁹⁰ deals largely with difficulties which a novice might raise about the Franciscan Rule, and it is significant that this work has been printed⁹¹ in *Bibliotheca Franciscana Ascetica Medii Aevii*⁹² since the opening of the century.

It is difficult to fit the works of Dr. G. G. Coulton into our scheme of classification, for his interest in Peckham flows over into several fields. He cites him frequently in his *Five Centuries of Religion*⁹³ in connection with various monastic abuses, purgation, etc. Much earlier, he had referred to the archbishop as a "saintly" man.⁹⁴ In his *Medieval Studies*,⁹⁵ he shows how Gasquet has distorted Peckham's injunction relative to education, as well as several other matters. In the *Medieval Village*⁹⁶ Dr. Coulton draws upon Peckham's *Registrum* for material dealing with monks who go hunting (p. 216), the ignorance of the clergy (p. 258), usury (p. 286), and clerical immorality (p. 437).

V. SCIENCE

Prof. A. G. Little's lectures⁹⁷ in 1916 brought it to the attention of an English audience that "John Pecham.....

⁸⁷ Deanesley, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

⁸⁸ London and Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., and New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1931. Especially p. 188f.

⁸⁹ Paris and Gembloux, 1928.

⁹⁰ Summarized in English in *Tractatus tres* (*supra*), pp. 109-10.

⁹¹ See A. G. Little in *Collectanea Franciscana* (*supra*), I, 21.

⁹² In Tom. IV. (Quaracchi, 1905).

⁹³ Volume II: *The Friars etc.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1927).

⁹⁴ *From St. Francis to Dante* (London, 1906), p. 294.

⁹⁵ First Series; 2nd. revised edition with three appendices (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., Ltd., 1915); and Second Series (London, 1907).

⁹⁶ Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

⁹⁷ *Studies in English Franciscan History* (*supra*), p. 220.

studied mathematics and optics under Bacon, and was first attracted and finally repelled by his astrological theories." This early interest of the Friar in astronomy had already been mentioned by P. Duhem⁹⁸ in his account of the history of that science in the Middle Ages. He seems to have recognized Peckham's importance in other fields also, for he spoke of him as one "*qui joua un si grand rôle dans les débats philosophiques et théologiques du XIII^e siècle*" (p. 515). Unfortunately, he places the date of Peckham's death in 1291 instead of 1292.

Peckham was an optician—not in the present meaning of the word but in its medieval significance, denoting a student of "perspective." As such, the Friar finds a place in the "magistral volumes" of the *Introduction to the History of Science*⁹⁹ by George Sarton, who regards Peckham as "more famous as an optician than as a philosopher" (p. 740). We are told that Peckham's *Perspectiva communis* "enjoyed a very long popularity (it was reprinted as late as 1627!)," and that printed editions contain a diagram of the eye, probably the first to appear in print.¹⁰⁰ This work received attention as recently as 1929, in the Polish article by A. Bednarski entitled "Anatomical Drawing of the Eye by Peckham,"¹⁰¹ presumably translated into German as "Das anatomische Augenbild von J. Peckham."¹⁰² Sarton also refers to Peckham as "primarily concerned with meteorology and optics," maintaining views similar to those of Roger Bacon (II, 750 and 762).

Peckham's *Perspectiva communis* had already been mentioned in Geyer's edition of *Friederich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (*supra*) although without much detail (pp. 465 and 555); and even earlier it had been accorded a cursory reference by Lynn Thorndike,¹⁰³ who also mentioned a work by Peckham on the sphere and a "Theory of the Planets," existing only in manuscript.

C. L. Vogel has edited a volume of essays by various scholars treating *Psychology and the Franciscan School*.¹⁰⁴ Here we find Peckham quoted and cited through Spettmann's editions:

98 *Le Système du Monde* (Paris, 1913-7), III, 515-7, 525, 527.

99 Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co., (1931), II, part 1, 23; part 2, 740, 750, 762, 823, 916, 951, 957, 1028-30.

100 *Ibid.* II, 1028-30.

101 *Archiv. hist. i filoz. med.*, IX (1929), 73-80.

102 *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin*, XXII (1929), 352-6.

103 *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York: Macmillan, 1923), II, 629.

104 Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., (1932).

a clear definition of the *rationes seminales* (p. 7); and a discussion of Plurality of Form, an account of unusual interest for it seeks to show this theory not only persisting but even gaining in biology and psychology today (pp. 46-9). Fr. Hubert Vechierello, O. F. M., Ph. D., gives some interesting references (p. 129f) to chemical analogies, the cultivation of nerve and glandular tissues outside the body (pp. 132-4), and even indicates identical twins as a related problem in scholastic thought (p. 137). It is possible to observe there the widening range of Spettmann's influence—he supplies material for Dr. D. E. Sharp at Oxford, who in turn is quoted or cited several times in this American work (pp. 44, 49, 63 and 64).

VI. LITURGICS

Peckham's place also in the history of liturgics has been recently recognized. Fr. Dr. Willibrord Lampen, O. F. M., has contributed a study on "Jean Pecham, O. F. M., et son Office de la S. Trinité,"¹⁰⁵ which opens with a valuable sketch of the great Friar's life. The treatment is critical, cautious, and well documented. The *Officium Beatissimae Trinitatis* is printed (pp. 223-9) with no comment save a brief introduction, historical and textual, but adequate to show the liturgiologica! position which the *Officium* occupies.

VII. POETRY

It may seem a far cry from science to poetry, yet the versatility of the Middle Ages was such that a student of science and a scholarly master of theology, philosophy and canon law might also write devotional—even mystical—poetry. But for such poetry to pass largely unnoticed for six hundred years and then to be translated into another tongue for a larger circle of readers is indeed worthy of note. The translation of Peckham's *Philomena* by William Dobell¹⁰⁶ is striking evidence of the recent recognition of the Archbishop in a field widely removed from his other activities.

In Germany, P. Hieronymus Spettmann, O. F. M., had earlier announced that Peckham "*gehört zu den bedeu-*

¹⁰⁵ *La France Franciscaine*, XI (1928), 211-29.

¹⁰⁶ London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1924. (The translation exhibits considerable skill, reasonable fidelity to the original, and occasional elegance of diction.)

tendsten Dichtern des lateinischen Mittelalters"¹⁰⁷; and Alexander Baumgartner had noted that the learned Mendicant "*verfaszte ein solches Offizium auf das Fest der allerheiligsten Dreifaltigkeit, das sich durch Tiefe der Gedanken, Majestät der Sprache und Leichtigkeit des Rhythmus auszeichnet*."¹⁰⁸

As a result of Spettmann's acceptance¹⁰⁹ of certain variants of Peckham's name, Emil Peeters¹¹⁰ has identified four poems in the MS. Vaticanus 4863 as Peckham's, on the assumption that "*Frater Johannes Pitzanus ordinis fratrum minorum, professor sacrae theologiae*" refers to John Peckham. These poems had already been printed in part by Dreves (*infra*) from a manuscript at Chartres, so Peeters's work constitutes an independent work, prefaced by many musical data supplied by the editor.

F. J. E. Raby devotes four pages¹¹¹ to a consideration of Peckham's poetry. He refers to the *Philomena* as "the loveliest of all the poems of the Passion the metre is handled with consummate mastery, and the cadence of the rhythm is exquisite filled with the new inspiration which was the secret of the gospel of Assisi . . . filled with this personal devotion to the Crucified." Ten stanzas of this poem are printed and also two stanzas from Peckham's *De Deliciis Virginis gloriosae*.

Wright and Sinclair have drawn heavily upon Raby's work in their *History of Later Latin Literature*,¹¹² and print only a single stanza of *Philomena*, prefaced by a brief sketch of Peckham's life. The real extent of his poetry may be seen in the twenty-four pages of his poems as edited by G. M. Dreves in *Lateinische Hymnendichter des Mittelalters*.¹¹³

VIII. MISCELLANEOUS—GENERAL, PERSONAL, ETC.

There remain some works which do not fit easily into any of the preceding fields and a few references which seem to defy

¹⁰⁷ "Quellenkritisches" (*supra*), p. 170.

¹⁰⁸ *Geschichte der Weltliteratur*, IV: *Die lateinische und griechische Literatur der christlichen Völker* (Freiburg i. B., and St. Louis, Mo., 1905), p. 455; note also p. 440, where Peckham is mentioned in company with St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventura, Jacopone da Todi and others.

¹⁰⁹ "Quellenkritisches" (*supra*).

¹¹⁰ "Vier Prosen des Johannes Peckham, O. F. M.," *Franziskanische Studien*, IV (1917), 355-67.

¹¹¹ *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), pp. 425-9.

¹¹² New York: Macmillan & Co., 1931; pp. 314-5.

¹¹³ Leipzig, Zweite Folge, 1907. In *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* (C. Blume and G. M. Dreves, editors), I, 592-616.

the classification adopted here. According to C. L. Kingsford,¹¹⁴ it was from the hands of Archbishop Peckham that Sir Otho de Grandisson received the cross before setting out for the Holy Land. Kingsford also refers to some trouble resulting from letters written by the Primate in which he had criticized the king (p. 184). Some years later, Kingsford made several references to Peckham in his *Grey Friars of London*,¹¹⁵ including mention of the Friar's work on the *Sentences* (p. 235).

W. W. Capes has accorded the opening chapter of his *History of the English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*¹¹⁶ to "The Primacy of Peckham"; makes generous use of the archiepiscopal register (without stating the individual references); and depicts the prelate as a staunch defender of the privileges of the Church, a strict disciplinarian (p. 289) and a reformer (p. 223). It is a balanced, trustworthy and thoroughly excellent presentation of Peckham's place in the general history of the Church of England.

For the Continental background of Peckham's times and for occasional reference to him, Albert Dufourcq's *L'Avenir du Christianisme*, vol. II: 1049-1300 is excellent.¹¹⁷ It recognizes Friar's varied influence—philosophical (pp. 361 and 364), scientific (p. 379), liturgical (p. 401)—and gives some useful bibliographical notes (p. 383).

The Reverend Professor Claude Jenkins, Librarian of Lambeth Palace, has discussed "Some Thirteenth Century Registers"¹¹⁸ with considerable attention to Peckham's *Registrum*, and has meted out to the editors some rather severe criticism. Long and important passages from it, the earliest existing Lambeth register, are here translated, or epitomized, or reproduced freely in a spirited and most readable style.¹¹⁹

114 "Sir Otho de Grandisson," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Third Series; III (1909), 138.

115 Aberdeen: University Press, 1915.

116 London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1920. (Vol. III of *A History of the English Church*, edited by W. R. W. Stephens and William Hunt.) The index data s. v. "Peckham" are defective, as the Primate's name appears also on pp. 35, 38, 132, 218, 223, 238, 240-1, 289, 293, 308, 311, 314-5 and 349.

117 Paris, Fifth edition, 1924 (†). For the pagination of the Sixth edition, c. 1932, add 154 to the page-numbers here given.

118 *Church Quarterly Review*, XCIX (1924-5), 69-115. The article deals with the registers of eight prelates.

119 *Op. cit.*, pp. 76-86 and 90-6. Also pp. 98-107, where illustrations of Peckham's turgid and rhetorical style are given in vigorous and amusing fashion.

R. L. Poole has printed¹²⁰ an interesting letter regarding the Archbishop's final illness, and has indicated¹²¹ that there had been talk of making him a cardinal.

The present writer has not been able to note here all the less significant references to Peckham occurring in European works¹²² and journals,¹²³ nor would such a list possess much value. In English works, many of the references, although more numerous than before 1900, are of no special significance for this study. Even the sections of the Archbishop's *Registrum* published by the Society of Canterbury and York¹²⁴ consist mainly of minor documents, often of only local or antiquarian interest.

It is becoming evident that no bibliographical study of Peckham can be regarded as more than tentative until his works have been sifted from those of (St) Bonaventura. Indeed, Professor Little writes that Fr. F. M. Delorme¹²⁵ has just recently ascribed to Peckham the "Epistola de Sandaliis Apostolorum" and the "Expositio super Regulam Ff. Minorum," formerly attributed to (St) Bonaventura.

INCREASING RECOGNITION

Certain observations seem justified by the foregoing data: (1) The number of works dealing with Peckham has exhibited a rapid increase since 1900, the number rising in each decade. (2) All the fields of Peckham's activities are represented in this literature. (3) The extent of the interest in Peckham may be judged by the spread of the countries represented and also by the language employed—German, French, English, Italian, Dutch, and Latin. (4) Peckham is coming to occupy an increasingly conspicuous position in several areas of medieval life and thought.

The question may reasonably occur: To what is this recent recognition of Peckham to be attributed? The present reviewer

120 "Report on the Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury," p. 261; in *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Various Collections*, 1901.

121 *Ibid.*, p. 276 note 3. (Some less significant references to Peckham are listed in the index, *ibid.*, p. 446.)

122 E. g., by Etienne Gilson, Father Cuthbert, Hartridge, *et al.*

123 E. g., *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, XIX (1918), Hft. 2, 96; *Franciskanische Studien*, II (1915), 112; III (1916), 77, 137, 200, 305, 308; IV (1917), 56, 93, 106, etc.

124 *Pars XIV* (1908) and *Pars XXII* (1910).

125 In the preface to his edition of *Meditatio Pauperis in Solitudine* (Quaracchi, 1929).

does not attempt to answer this question with any finality; but he tentatively suggests the following possible reasons for this increased interest: (1) General progress in medieval studies in recent years; (2) Increasing emphasis upon research among manuscript collections; (3) The accrediting to Peckham of several works formerly attributed to (St) Bonaventura; and (4) The new interest in the history of religious education.

THE SIGNIFICANCE TO CHURCH HISTORY OF THE CHANGE FROM THE TEMPOR- ARY TO THE PERMANENT IN FOREIGN MISSIONS

WILLIAM D. SCHERMERHORN

Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois

It is an interesting matter of conjecture just how long it would have taken for John the Baptist to transfer the leadership of the religious group which he founded to Jesus, if John had kept free from the toils of the Roman law and Herod had not set him aside. Judging by the persistence of the John cult among the churches of the East we may believe that the process would have been slow. Just so the modern missionary, whose era may be dated during the past one hundred and fifty years, although he has always announced that his rôle was that of John the Baptist, has nevertheless moved slowly in helping the national leaders to "increase" while he "decreased."

The past generation has seen a quickening of the pace in the transfer of authority from missionary to the national leaders. This increase in speed in addition to the efforts of certain missionaries and nationals has been due chiefly to three causes: first, the phenomenal increase of nationalism. Certain political groups have set goals and standards from which they have not deviated—to cite as instances, Japan, Turkey, the Latin American states, Italy and Germany—and the persistent following of these goals has aroused a spirit of patriotism amounting to fervor among the nations of the earth. This strong nationalistic urge finds sympathetic response in a desire for autonomy among the leaders of the younger churches. Second, the development of a group of Christians in each of the major countries, which group is sufficiently large, and has experience adequate to manage its own affairs, has naturally given rise to jealousy of any control from the outside and an eagerness to assume charge of their own churches. Third, the events, political and economic, which have forced the withdrawal of thousands of missionaries

have been a moving influence in the tendency to achieve the situation in which the suggestion of the Laymen's Inquiry Commission may well be remembered:

"A mission by definition is intrinsically temporary; the time comes when established centers of religious life must be left to develop according to the genius of the place."

The laymen further suggest that in the permanent phase in the life of the younger churches, which conceivably is now in process of being set up, world-understanding and unity should be promoted through the ambassadorship of a few highly equipped persons and "through institutions for the study of theology and civilization."

It is unquestionably true that the foreign missionary movement is moving from what may be considered as a temporary type to a more permanent and fully established status. The missionary will doubtless continue for many years to work alongside the leaders in their own country but direction of the work will rapidly pass to the hands of the nationals. In a situation such as this the Church History Society, which may be considered "an institution for the study of theology and civilization," may properly be asking what the implications of this change will be for such a society and its membership.

I. First, it may be said that the shifting emphasis should arouse the interest and attention of church historians in a field hitherto largely neglected. Two very respectable examples will suffice to establish the claim of neglect. Walker's *History of the Christian Church*, which has been a representative brief account of the development of Christianity gives but two pages to the whole modern Protestant mission, less than to the discussion of the Quakers. A more recent and larger work is *An Outline of Christianity*, in five volumes, edited by distinguished American and British scholars. Out of twenty-five-hundred pages it gives but fifty to "The Story of Christian Missions." It hardly will be possible for a future historian to make so scant a reference to a section of Christianity which is of importance in four continents. While it may be said, by way of excuse, that these mission churches are relatively new and history deals only with what is past, we now realize that for the present historian the whole missionary movement has come into

such a sufficiently established status that it ought not to escape the attention of any really scientific worker.

II. Another item of significance is that we should have a more factual and less promotional, or one might say, emotional type of record. Very much of what has been written regarding the younger churches has had a primary interest in arousing a benevolent response. Three recent examples of promotional interest may be cited, for each one presents a slightly different aspect of the common habit. Recently a prominent pastor in a mid-western city in criticizing the Laymen's Inquiry said that "in these times when money was scarce and missionary interest wanting those men should have brought back to the church a report of inspiration and enthusiasm which would have at once put the whole missionary cause on its feet." His primary expectation was not accuracy but exhortation. In a mission station in Asia a member of the Church History Commission, talking with a very hard working missionary, was asked "What can be done to increase the gifts to the missionary cause?" The missionary spread out four or five samples of circular letters which had gone to his home constituency soliciting special gifts. Pointing to each letter in turn he stated in dollars and cents just what the harvest had been from each. He was now preparing to write again and like a good fisherman was asking on the basis of results which bait he should use for the next cast. The third example had to do with adverse criticism of a missionary publication, the editorial writer suggesting that "it did not present the *thrilling*, the *romantic* and *heroic* as largely as we normally expect in a missionary document." I do not suggest that in either case the person cited would have wished actual falsehood to be told, but certainly the story of a rising church which is written with special attention to the power of the story to secure a monetary response is not exactly history. There is a feeling among some students today that really too great care has been taken to making missionary reports romantic and we are now in for an era of plain fact-telling without sycophantic selection or elaboration.

III. The period through which we are passing opens up the opportunity and lays a new responsibility upon historians to urge provision for collection and preservation of all sources of the history of these missions which are coming into the status of churches. One handicap in our work is that in previous eras of

the church either through carelessness or through some catastrophe our sources have been allowed completely to disappear. The Church History Commission in its study found examples of such losses. In Japan, for instance, in the severity with which the Japanese sought to stamp out the Roman Catholic missions under the Edict of Expulsion the attempt was made to destroy all documentary evidences of Christianity. Today only archeological evidences make clear how widely the Christian movement had spread. If extensive literary records of early Japanese Christianity are sought they will probably be found only in the correspondence of the missionaries which reached their fellow-monks in Lisbon, Madrid, Rome, and Manila. The ancient Syrian church of India among its several divisions has no archives worthy of mention. Either they were not careful to keep records, or else the struggle between Portuguese, Dutch, and British, together with the religious battles incident to those wars, have completely wiped out all literary records. In Japan, again, a visit to the Orthodox Metropolitan, Sergius of Tokyo, revealed that the literary records of that remarkable church perished completely in the fire incident to the great earthquake. Sergius, whose long service with Nicolai has given him a vast fund of information, is trying amid many pressing executive duties to write a biography of Nicolai which he promises will also be a history of the church. It is difficult to restrain the fear that he may not find time to complete it. The Copts of Egypt who claim to form an unbroken connection with apostolic Christianity have in their great museum at Cairo inadequate protection from fire, and if mob violence should arise, a priceless collection would go the way of the world renowned libraries of Alexandria and Pergamum. There is a danger that that which happened with reference to the apostles and their immediate successors, may be repeated in our time in every great missionary area. What would we not give for an accurate history written from sources of the first hundred years of Christian life, instead of the records compiled from the meager fragments which are at hand! If one could imagine a group of men at about the year one hundred who could have made use of sources then possibly available for such a record, he would have a situation comparable to that faced by church historians of our day. As they sense both their opportunity and its emergency it becomes evident that here is a really urgent task demanding attention.

IV. It is evident then that two things press to be done with the materials which are now in danger of being lost. First, there must be provided a plan whereby missionaries and nationals throughout the world may be aroused to an interest in caring for their sources; and second, it is altogether probable that this can best be done by stirring them up to undertake the writing of their history. Much of what would be produced would be fragmentary. It might possibly be the record of some one congregation or some small district, or of a single denomination. The attempt to write such a history would impress the author with his need of adequate and reliable sources.

V. In this time of transition, certain major problems emerge which will not be effectively studied excepting in the light which historical research can throw upon them. For instance, the report of the Commission on the Mass Movement in India, the recent appearance of which has stimulated us to further interest, will need to have, before it reaches completion, a thoroughgoing background of historical study. There have been other mass movements in the history of Christianity and this one will be better understood in the light of what we may learn from them.

The matter of syncretism which now attracts so much attention and arouses considerable controversy will never be properly weighed save on the scales of historical experience. In fact, the very definition of the essence of Christianity will depend upon such a study. Is Christianity a fixed quantum or is it a changing, living, assimilating life?

The study of religious liberty which is a major problem today will need to be prefaced not only by the searching philosophical prelude of Dr. Hocking but also by a diligent and level-headed presentation of facts in history which relate to that matter.

VI. A major quest of Christianity today is for church union. A platform or test for a new catholicity is being sought. The ancient church found its criteria in a common Rule of Faith, a common canon of Scripture, and in an episcopal form of government. We have no right to assume either that they found the best basis for union, or even if it was best for them that it may be so for our own day. Nothing other than a comprehensive study will give us an adequate basis for the setting up of the catholicity which seems bound to occur among the Chris-

tian people in the next few generations. At the present time there are at least three types which are being tried: complete uniformity in doctrine and discipline as is proposed in the South India United Church; or, a scheme which requires a minimum basis of doctrinal unanimity with large marginal liberties, as in the Church of Christ in China; or, in some federation which seeks only cooperation in good work among those who confess a common Lord, as seems to be the plan in the new scheme for Protestantism in the Philippine Islands.

These and other problems which arise must be studied in their historical bearing if the church is to avoid the dangers incident to short-sighted and immediate plans.

VII. As the younger churches come to new increments of power it will be the function of church history to help them to recognize themselves as part of an ancient and persistently continuing world movement. The process by which these churches have been raised up is such that in many cases they have come to think of themselves merely as "missions" attached to foreign leadership and living in the midst of well established institutions of their own land. They have had little opportunity to see themselves in relation to other groups which are contemporary or as integrated in a long chain of historical movements which have come down across the centuries and have outlived the vicissitudes of empires. When missionary friends are being taken away and funds from abroad are either depleted or completely withdrawn, no one thing could be of greater help in strengthening the morale of the younger Christian groups than to feel themselves a constituent part of a great history to which they themselves are even now making a contribution. They are "heirs of all the ages in the foremost ranks of time."

VIII. The historian himself has the opportunity of developing a great field where there are few precedents to lay their restraining hand upon him. May we not hope that it will be the occasion of seizing the opportunity to develop an improved technique? Much of church history has been written as if the church existed in a vacuum. Whole centuries have been covered in some treatises almost without reference to contemporary events or cultures. The present-day writing of church history certainly demands that the Christian progress be presented as

one feature of the world's development rather than in complete isolation.

In the history of the younger churches this is particularly important. To cite a few instances: one can never properly understand the struggle for indigenous control of Doshisha University in Japan or the quick rush to establish the union of denominational groups there without knowledge of the national fear of the Japanese people that they would be devoured as China was being treated just across the Sea of Japan. It is worthy of note that the Church of Christ in China which had been in process of formation for a number of years, really came to a complete organization in 1927, the year when the Cantonese group made their famous march northward and set up the government in the capital at Nanking. One cannot avoid observing that the two great movements toward unity in India, in the South and in the North, have had their most active growth during the period of intense nationalism incident to the political struggles for independence under the leadership of Gandhi and the Congress Party.

Again, church history may well be written with a much more restricted apologetic or dogmatic interest. Surely this study has to do with something other than the defense of a particular type of organization, ritual, or dogma.

In some way the growth of Christianity should be presented more vitally. The story of the development of the church must be related to life both as it was and as it is. This has not always been done in the past. A study of some improvements of technique shows a smaller attention to dates, a minor interest in the multitude of small controversies which have vexed the church, and a greater appreciation of dynamic and creative personalities who have actually contributed to life as well as to a few great epochal movements which have really marked turning points in the progress of Christianity.

IX. Certainly we shall need to remember that we are not the only group which is now at work in the field of internationalism. Dr. Mott is authority for the statement that there is provision for study on international relations in not fewer than one hundred and fifty universities and colleges of our day. He also calls attention to the number of exchange professorships, to the Rhodes Scholarships, to the League of Nations, and the Inter-

national Labor Office. We call to mind also the Institute of Pacific Relations and the fact that industry, politics, sociology, linguistics, literature, anthropology, art, education, medicine, and religion are now all studied on an international scope. The missionary historian must present his material as part of a great world complex. What he does must be done in relation to the work of other learned societies, and unless his work is of as high a grade and as eligible a quality as theirs, it were better left undone.

X. In conclusion, one cannot avoid saying that the present trend in the foreign missionary work sets before the American Society of Church History and similar groups wherever organized a responsibility which is world wide and immediate in its challenge and which gives a prospect of results which are well worth any amount of labor. With such a task on our work-table we probably should be staggered at first, but possibly we should be aroused to find means and comrades in other lands so that there would be made possible an adequate history of the Christianity in these younger churches in Japan, in China, in India, in Malaysia, in Oceania and Australasia, in the Near East, in Africa, in Mexico and the Caribbean, and in South America. No research problem of such size has been definitely attempted as yet. Possibly the American Society of Church History should at least raise a committee which would explore the project and determine the duties and the privileges of our Society in connection with it.

IN MEMORIAM

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., LL.D.

Rev. Peter Ainslie, minister of the Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md., died on February 23, 1934. Born at Dunnsville, Virginia, on June 3, 1867, and educated at Transylvania University, at the age of twenty-four he was called to the pastorate of the church with which he continued his ministry until his death forty-three years later. During these years the congregation planted and sponsored eight other churches and established a variety of social and educational activities. In addition to the heavy load of pastoral and administrative work that he carried, he was deeply interested in the cause of world peace and was a trustee of the Church Peace Union, but his greatest concern was for the unity of the church and he was most widely known for his activity in the interest of reunion. He founded *The Christian Union Quarterly* in 1911, and was its editor until his death. He was President of the national convention of Disciples of Christ in 1910, and in that year he took the lead in organizing the Association for the Promotion of Christian Union, of which he was president until 1925. Opposition to his liberal views on the part of the more conservative element of his denomination led to his retirement from that office but served only to confirm his devotion to the widest possible fellowship of Christians. The formula under which he finally organized his attitudes and his program for unity was "the equality of all Christians before God." His earliest publications were text-books for the study of the Old Testament and the New Testament. In 1913 he delivered a series of lectures at Yale Divinity School, which were published under the title *The Message of the Disciples for the Union of the Church*. He was a member of the deputation sent to Great Britain in 1913-1914 by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States in preparation for the World Conference on Faith and Order. His later books, both dealing with the theme of reunion which was central to his thought, were *If Not a United Church—What?* (1920) and *The Scandal of Christianity* (1929). While he was always more interested in the making of the history of Christianity in what he considered its next inevitable phase than in the study of the past, he was an active member of the American Society of Church History for many years.

W. E. Garrison.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH AND STATE IN LATIN AMERICA

By J. LLOYD MECHAM. Chapel Hill, N. C.; The University of North Carolina Press, 1934. viii, 550 pages. \$4.50.

Organized religion has played a much larger part in the political history of the Hispanic American Republics than it has in the United States. Throughout the entire colonial period the Roman Catholic Church was not only the dominant influence in the cultural life of Hispanic America, but it was also a large and important factor in governmental affairs. It was but natural, therefore, that this close relationship between church and state which had existed in colonial times should have been continued after independence, and the Roman Catholic Church was established by law in the first constitutions of all of Hispanic American republics as they emerged.

Due largely to the peculiar situation which prevailed in Spain as a result of the long struggle with the Moors, by the time of the discovery of America the Spanish sovereigns had been granted a larger control over the church than perhaps any other European monarchs. But "the union of altar and throne was much more intimate in America than in Spain." "Indeed it is difficult," says the author, "to conceive of a more absolute jurisdiction than that which the kings of Spain exercised over all the ecclesiastical affairs of the Indies." The *real patronato de Indias* was described by an eighteenth century Spanish official as "La piedra mas rica, la mas preciosa Margarita de su real diadema." (p. 12). The author therefore, rightly devotes his first chapter to a clear presentation of the relation of church and state during the colonial period.

To this reviewer the most interesting part of the book is the author's discussion of the relation of the Catholic church to the Spanish-American revolutions (Chapters II and III). The aid of religion was invoked by both sides in the struggle, but there was no religious issue involved. All the revolutionary leaders, with the possible exception of Bolivar, were loyal Catholics, and even the great "Liberator" in the last hours of his life urged upon the Constituent Congress of Bogata that they "protect the holy religion which we profess." The difficulties confronted by the three reigning popes from 1810 to 1835, over the question of the recognition of the independence of the new Hispanic-American republics is concisely set forth in Chapter III. The whole question of patronage was involved in the papal recognition of independence, and the author makes the interesting observation that to the present day "the papacy has never recognized patronage as being an inherent right in sovereignty" (p. 105).

The remainder of the book, and by far the largest part in bulk, Chapters IV to XVII, is devoted to separate accounts of the relationship of church and state in each of the Hispanic-American republics. There is a considerable degree of similarity in the history of that relationship in most of the republics. In all of the republics there have arisen two political parties, generally termed the *Liberal* and the *Conservative*, the latter standing for a close relationship between church and state and a large degree of clerical control, while the former has stood, in a number of instances, for complete separation of church and state, and always for a large degree of toleration. Because of the greater interest in this country in Mexico, the author has treated the Mexican situation at greatest length, and has devoted three long and detailed chapters to that interesting story (Chapters XIV-XVI).

In the final chapter the author presents some very interesting conclusions. Among them is, that the Latin American republics, though Catholics constitute a vast majority of the population in all of them, have found it necessary to hedge their church about with many restrictions because of its old habit of meddling in politics and assuming an inordinate supervision over the lives of its parishioners. Several of the republics have already achieved a satisfactory solution of the vexed question, but most of them have still a long way to travel before religious liberty and separation of church and state can become accomplished facts.

The entire book is a model of clarity and those who are especially interested in the history and culture of our Latin American neighbors will be grateful for this scholarly presentation of a most difficult subject.

W. W. Sweet.

The University of Chicago.

THE CONCORDAT OF 1801: A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF NATIONALISM IN THE RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE

By HENRY H. WALSH. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933.
259 pages. \$3.50.

Until the French Revolution the quarrel of church and state in France consisted chiefly of the monarchs' efforts to force the clergy to acknowledge the predominance of the temporal power in national affairs. It had been a winning fight for the kings, but not a complete victory, since, on the eve of the Revolution, the church still possessed great power. It was wealthy, enjoyed a large degree of autonomy, and a monopoly upon salvation, and vital statistics, as well as social and charitable enterprises like education and hospitals. It therefore continued to play so large a part in the daily lives of Frenchmen as to render it highly dubious whether, in case of conflict, they would be more loyal to the secular ruler than to the clergy. But the Revolution accomplished for a time what the kings

had been unable to do. It confiscated the wealth and destroyed the independence of the church, gave greater toleration to the minority religions, permitted civil marriage and divorce, and made education and charity important phases of the state's activity. The church became thoroughly dependent upon the state and its activity strictly limited to religion and ritual. Perhaps this was the most significant victory for French nationalism in all the history of that country. Thereby the most important events of a man's life—his birth, marriage, death and, if need be, divorce—now became civil matters, in which the secular authority was at least as much concerned as the church. When Napoleon Bonaparte became master of France, he had two choices open to him. He might endeavor to destroy the church entirely, making it forever impossible that it compete with the state for the loyalty of Frenchmen, or he might try to convert it into a hierarchy for the deification of the nation. He chose the latter alternative; he gave to the clergy government support and in return expected subservience. His own difficulties and a resulting century of conflict have proved that he made a bad bargain.

The story of the negotiations which ended in the reestablishment of the Catholic church in France and its struggle to maintain the small degree of independence granted by the Concordat of 1801 has often been told in heavier and more learned tomes than the one under consideration. The justification of the present volume would be, if it were well done, that the author attempted to review these episodes as a student of nationalism. For a book is needed which will show how Bonaparte spoiled his chance to make a nationalist instrument out of the Gallican church. Actually, however, what is said in this volume about nationalism is very little and much of that is concerned neither with the negotiations nor the struggle, but with the attitudes of the principal figures in them before and after they took place. Only a small part, therefore, of what is here narrated is directly pertinent to the Concordat of 1801.

The reason for this is largely the awkward manner of presentation which the author adopted. Seven of the ten chapters in the book (the exceptions being the first two and a rather irrelevant conclusion) are biographical. Thus, what one learns about the "problem of nationalism" is narrated chiefly in setting forth the opinions held by the leading proponents and opponents of the Concordat. This leads to much repetition, many cross-references, and a general patchiness. Several of the chapters, besides, depend largely upon the "standard" biography of the gentlemen under consideration—frequently rather old studies of churchmen written by other churchmen. The one on Emery contains fifty-six footnotes, of which all but thirteen refer to Gosselin's *Vie de M. Emery* (Paris, 1861): and of these thirteen, ten are references to passages *supra* or *infra* in the present volume itself. Much the same is true regarding the study of d'Astros, which depends almost exclusively upon the biography by Causette published in 1853. The other chapters err in the same way, though not to the same degrees.

There is, however, much in these pages which, though not derived from original documents, is placed in a new light. Consequently, if one or-

ganizes it for himself as he goes along, there can be learned from this book a great deal about the problem of nationalism as involved in the negotiations of and the struggle resulting from the Concordat. If one should take the trouble to do this, however, it would be desirable to avoid the author's assumption that nationalism began with the French Revolution and since then has developed along certain easily separated and classified lines, such as "Jacobin," "liberal," and "integral" nationalism. It would be wise also to be more hesitant in ascribing so much of the evil of the French Revolution to Rousseau's influence.

Louis Gottschalk.

The University of Chicago.

LES LÉGENDES DE CONSTANTINE ET DE MÉTHODE VUES DE BYZANCE

By FR. DVORNÍK. Prague: "Orbis," 1933. ix. 443 pages. Kč. 90.

The author of this work, a professor at the Charles University in Prague, has set for himself the task of evaluating critically the historical accuracy of the two chief sources of the lives and work of the two "apostles of the Slavs," Constantine (usually known under his monastic name of Cyrill) and Methodius, namely, the Church-Slavonic "Pannonian legends," a translation of which he provides in the appendix of the work. He has already made a valuable contribution to this field by his *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX^e siècle*. He manifests such complete mastery of the subject that his treatment of it is unusually suggestive and he shows an insight rarely manifested by his predecessors in the task; hence, he makes a number of contributions of great value not only in relation to the two Greek brothers, but to our present knowledge of the history of the ninth century, particularly as far as the relation between the Eastern and Western churches is concerned.

Thus, for instance, he adduces convincing arguments to show that the position to which the young Constantine was appointed at the court of Patriarch Ignatius was not that of a "librarian," but the important post of "chartophylax," an office sometimes equivalent to that of the first secretary of the patriarch. But the brilliant pupil of Photius found his new duties distasteful, possibly because of the tension existing between the university circles to which he as a scholar of note belonged, and the patriarchal court. After a short retirement, Constantine succeeded Photius, who in the meantime was elected to the patriarchate, as teacher of philosophy. Later, he served as a trusted representative of the government on a diplomatic mission to the Arabs and the Khazars of Crimea. On the latter occasion Constantine found what he believed were the relics of St. Clement of Rome, but what the author thinks were the relics of some local saint of the same name (pp. 192, 196). The Moravian mission of the two brothers, for which chiefly they became known in history,

and the extremely complicated relation of East to West during this period, consequent upon the struggle of Patriarch Photius with Pope Nicholas I, are treated with masterly skill. Dr. Dvorník suggests an interesting theory (p. 268) that Pope Innocent I invited the two brothers who had been working in Moravia to Rome only when he heard that they were on their way to Constantinople to secure the consecration of their disciples. The mooted question of the "orthodoxy" of the two Greek missionaries and the problem as to the extent to which they acknowledged the pretensions of the papacy to universal primacy are treated skilfully, but on the basis of an implied or expressed assumption that the papal claims to universal jurisdiction are historically justified and were admitted even in the East. (pp. 295 ff.)

In general, the author, after subjecting them to the closest scrutiny, found that the Pannonian legends are substantially correct in their historical implications. In fact, he regards them "*parmi les meilleurs documents* historico-littéraires slaves et byzantins du IX^e siècle. Ce sont des textes de premier ordre qui témoignent clairement de l'évolution de Byzance et de l'Europe centrale à cette époque" (p. 336). In his judgment, the two *Lives* were either written by the same author—a Byzantine Slav—or produced in a Graeco-Slavic Moravian school in the ninth century (p. 332); their author might have been any one of the disciples who accompanied the brothers to Moravia, and who were expelled from that country after the death of Archbishop Methodius (885). The author of the *Life of Constantine* certainly drew upon the information obtained from Methodius.

There is only one slight mistake made by the author in referring to a work by "M. Giffert"; the work is by A. C. McGiffert (p. 201).

Matthew Spinka.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

FROM SABBATH TO SUNDAY

By PAUL COTTON. Bethlehem, Pa.: Times Publishing Company, 1933. 184 pages. \$1.50.

The author sets out, as he himself says, on a personal exploration of early Christian history to find the explanation of the fact that Christendom, with but a comparatively small group to the contrary, has come—and did so already at an early time—to observe the first day of the week instead of the seventh day which was the rest-day of its founder and his first adherents.

The ultimate finding is not new, that Sunday observance came about only as a gradual historical development. Nor is it a new view that pagan practices, such as sun worship, and the spirit of opposition to Judaism were important factors in this change. But that Judaism itself should have

made a definite and positive contribution is a rather startling suggestion. However, here is the argument as it proceeds along three lines: The Christian Reaction to the Sabbath (ch. II), Judaism and the Rise of Sunday (ch. III), and the Non-Jewish Influences (ch. IV).

In first century Judaism rabbinic legislation had resulted in making the Sabbath burdensome. However, the *'Am ha-Ares* took a careless attitude in their habits of observing it as well as other laws. Inasmuch as this laxity of the common people was especially marked in Galilee, and in view of certain preserved sayings of Jesus, it is probable that he and his disciples were spokesmen of this liberal attitude. This situation created a bridge to the Pauline revolt and the Gentile Christian abandonment of the day. Then, the Jews had themselves made only lenient requirements of their Gentile proselytes in respect to the Sabbath. This, too, was an important factor preparing the way for Paul's own liberal interpretations which culminated in his acceptance only of the new law of the spirit which rejected ceremonial laws. Among the ceremonial laws was classed that of the Sabbath because it was preeminently ceremonial in its purpose and observance. Later Christian interpretations definitely treated circumcision and Sabbath as of one kind. However, there was a very strong conservative trend which preserved the Sabbath, which trend was noticeable in certain Logia, the Ebionites, and even the third and fourth century groups who retained the Sabbath as a memorial of creation though they had also accepted Sunday as commemorating the resurrection.

While these factors did not in and of themselves represent a break with Judaism, it was, nevertheless, inevitable that a strong opposition should develop. This is traceable already in the events of Paul's travels and more markedly, of course, in Johannine and post-apostolic literature. This made for the acceptance of a unique Christian day. Certainly after 70 A. D. it was tangible, while it may have resulted in a Sunday observance as early as 50 A. D. But Sunday had a Jewish origin. From Judaism were derived the idea of a weekly sacred day; the earliest designation, First Day of the Week; the pattern for its ritual. When the First Day observance began it was rather an extension of the Sabbath into the next day. On Sabbath Jewish customs were observed, but then after sunset the specific Christian interests were cultivated: cultic taking of contributions, a matter of convenience as soon as possible after the Sabbath; and the breaking of bread, which seems to have been a Christian adaptation of the Jewish Habbalah (sunset worship). The next stage of development came with the thought that the First Day, as the day of the resurrection, might well be observed with feasting, while the Sabbath, as the day of the Lord's death, should more properly be observed with fasting. Thus the Sabbath came to be fully reproduced on the First Day, which day in turn came to be called "The Lord's Day." The new name made it popular and gave it new meaning and preeminence as against the Sabbath, while its pagan associations (from the emperor days, etc.) marked it as the particular sacred day of the Jesus-cult as against the days of other cults.

The substitution of the designation "Lord's Day" for "First Day" denoted a clear breaking away from the Sabbath, which became the gen-

eral Christian attitude and demand by the middle of the 2nd century. The final change was attained when under the influx of great numbers of pagan converts and the influence of Mithraism's sun worship the "Lord's Day" became "Sunday," in which name its supreme position over the other days of the week (dedicated to the various planetary deities) was established. This position was reached and fortified exegetically and doctrinally from the last half of the second century onward. Finally, Sunday was legalized by Constantine the Great (non-Jewish influence) as the rest-day of his empire, and with this act even the Jewish character of Sunday was definitely lost, for pagan ideas of observing a sacred day formed the basis of this law and, henceforth, practice.

Space does not here permit a discussion of the debatable points, as for instance the interpretation of Rev. 1:10 (where "Lord's Day" is perhaps rather a designation of "Day of Yahweh"); of Ignatius, Magnesians 9 (which seems to have a mystical meaning rather than being a call to Sunday observance); of *Didache* 14 (which is not obviously a reference to a weekly "Lord's Day"); and certainly the dating before 70 A. D. of the radical opposition to Judaism and the origin of a distinct day as against or even in addition to the Sabbath. The contribution as a whole is very plausible, however, and will meet with wide-spread acceptance.

Frederick A. Schilling.

Walla Walla College.

THE NEW CHURCH AND THE NEW GERMANY

By CHARLES S. MACFARLAND. New York: Macmillan, 1934. 209 pages. \$2.25.

It is very difficult to speak and to write on the "New Germany." Events move so quickly that it seems impossible to formulate an opinion or a judgment which will not be immediately questioned. Furthermore, the whole situation is so heavily charged with emotional factors of all sorts—historical, political, racial, economic, religious—that an attempt to comprehend it easily produces emotional upsets in speakers, writers, hearers and readers alike. This lack of balanced attitude characterizes most of what the Germans are saying, but it is also noticeable in practically everything which we, in this country, hear and read about Germany. The most unfortunate aspect of this emotional upheaval is that we often fail to recognize that Germany is a battlefield of many possibilities. For the victory of National Socialism has certainly not been accompanied by the quick solution of any one problem.

In view of all this Dr. MacFarland's book has two distinct merits: In the first place it offers a picture of the church conflict which demonstrates most clearly the fact that the Germans themselves are engaged in a struggle for the new order of things. Secondly, it is written in a sympathetic spirit, which I count to be a distinct merit. Dr.

Macfarland is far from being uncritical in his observations, but that does not prevent him from being as irenic as possible in his willingness to understand facts and events which are baffling, both on account of their sudden newness and their apparent radicalness.

The book is written in the lively fluent style of a narrator. Dr. Macfarland offers a first hand report of what he (who calls himself a long-time friend of Germany) saw and heard and read during a brief visit abroad which was undertaken with the distinct purpose of gaining information on what was happening. He presents personal recollections, he describes interviews with all sorts of men, dwelling with particular emphasis—or shall I say pleasure?—on his hour with Hitler himself, he reports much hearsay which came to him from many sources that remain anonymous, and most significantly he reprints important documents of all types—i. e. church laws, declarations, statements, protests, etc. In other words, his book is highly informing. Sometimes it is even somewhat chaty. To the uninitiated reader it will therefore give a good picture of the kaleidoscopic scene of contemporary German Protestantism.

It has, however, evident shortcomings, which are due partly to the limitations which the author has set for himself and partly to definite limitations of his outlook. Dr. Macfarland writes as a friendly Christian who is concerned for ecumenical Christianity but he does not write as a political historian or as a theologian. But, in my opinion, no one can adequately describe and judge the church situation in Germany, unless he is willing to enter into the ring of the political debate and unless he is courageous enough to take sides in the theological conflict.

If I were to describe Dr. MacFarland's work in one sentence, I should say that he has written a book of understanding, but hardly one of penetration. In order to be just, it must be admitted that it may not yet be possible to write a fully objective and critical book, and in order not to appear ungrateful, I wish to emphasize that I consider his understanding an achievement of no mean measure. His book is the best introduction to a study of the present German church conflict which is now available to us.

Wilhelm Pauck.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

A HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

By LARS P. QUALBEN. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1933.
xxii, 590 pages. \$2.50.

The distinctive feature of Professor Qualben's church history is his emphasis on American Christianity, which occupies nearly a third of the book. The medieval period receives less than a tenth. So much attention to the new world will be welcome to American students and teachers. Yet it seems like going too far in a right direction, for the whole picture

is thrown somewhat out of proportion. American church history itself would be better interpreted at some places where medieval religion more fully described. Professor Qualben treats the American history chiefly in several denominational groups, tracing the development of each through the national period. A synthetic account would exhibit better the main tendencies in American religion. But the method chosen emphasizes denominational characteristics and significant differences, and gives opportunity for much detail of ecclesiastical life. Nowhere else are so many facts about the American churches packed into so many pages. The consideration of Christianity in Latin America should be mentioned.

The narrative in general is clearly organized and intelligent. The book inclines to be a compendium of facts rather than an interpretation of movements and trends. It is remarkably complete, including Christian organizations of many kinds and in many places which the books usually neglect. A strange omission is the mystery religions. With no thought of disparagement it may be said that the presentation is influenced by the Lutheran version of Christianity and by a literalist view of the Bible. The account of the primitive church accepts the New Testament statements uncritically and expounds them in harmony with Lutheran standards. That "Christ intended to organize a church" is said to be shown by his providing the essentials of organization, the preaching of the word, the two sacraments, instituted by Him, church officers, disciplinary authority. "Jesus Christ and his apostles" taught justification *sola fide*. The three great original principles of Christianity, it is said twice, are the Bible as the sole authority, justification by faith and the priesthood of all believers. Luther and the Lutheran reformation receive large space, and the Anabaptists are minimized; but Reformed history is recounted with insight and appreciation.

It must be said that there are too many misprints, especially misspellings of names, and too many inaccurate statements. The Jews, it is asserted, were not exempted from the requirements of the Roman state religion. Constantine "made Christianity the Religious Department of the State." The *Dictatus Papae* is ascribed to Gregory VII. A paragraph is entitled "Scotch-Irish Presbyterians organized at Long Island in 1640"; there were no Scotch-Irish and no Presbyterianism on Long Island at this date. Methodists are said to have come to Virginia in the early thirties of the eighteenth century, when there were no Methodists. The legendary "Mecklenburg Resolves" of 1775 appear again. That errors in matters of fact occur is especially regrettable in view of Professor Qualben's industry, learning and desire to be fair-minded and sympathetic.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

CARDINAL NEWMAN AND WILLIAM FROUDE, F. R. S.:
A CORRESPONDENCE

Edited by GORDON HUNTINGTON HARPER. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1934. 221 pages. \$2.00.

In his most recent work Professor Whitehead gives an interesting list of those books which in a general way have influenced his thinking about adventures of ideas; one of them is Newman's *Essay on Development*. This is but a recent example of Newman's influence upon minds whose bent is scientific rather than religious, philosophical rather than theological. One reason for Newman's great influence upon others was his own sensitivity to their influence. Newman was a magnificent controversialist because his own mind had always explored for itself the enemies' position, and often had fought in their ranks. Newman is commonly thought of as the illustrious convert from Anglicanism to Roman Catholicism, but that conversion was only a major engagement in a long mental conflict. Newman was one of the first to understand the modern mood, which he called Liberalism, and one of the first consciously to oppose it.

In publishing the correspondence between Newman and William Froude, Dr. Harper has rendered a valuable service not only to those interested in Newman, but also to those who are interested in nineteenth century thought. This correspondence (whose importance Wilfred Ward had already indicated) illustrates the famous opposition between religion and science much more clearly than, for example, the controversy between Huxley and Wilberforce. Wilberforce had a mind vastly inferior to Newman's, and Huxley had a dogmatic temper, whereas William Froude really did exhibit the impartiality of a true scientist. For twenty-five years the two friends, the one destined to become a cardinal, the other an agnostic, kept up a correspondence on the theme of faith and knowledge. Certainly Froude's arguments influenced Newman, whose *Grammar of Assent* is almost a formal answer to the questions Froude asked. Indeed the correspondence between Newman and William Froude is the best possible introduction to that most difficult of Newman's works.

But the correspondence which Dr. Harper has edited has another value as well. It casts a happy light upon controversy between gentlemen. Froude had the trial of seeing first his wife and then his children converted by Newman to Roman Catholicism; he felt the blows deeply but never charged, and never had reason to charge, Newman with exerting improper influence. Relations between the two friends were often difficult but always candid.

Dr. Harper has done a useful work well. His comments on the correspondence are judicious and illuminating; his arrangement excellent. In the issue between the two friends Dr. Harper apparently sides with the scientist; once at least, I think, this sympathy with Froude's position leads him to misjudgment of Newman. Dr. Harper writes (p. 29), "I, relying on human experience. . . ." Newman unfortunately neglected another fact

of experience quite as universally recognized as instinctive promptings namely, that the certainty which these promptings produce is frequently proved ephemeral." In view of well known passages in the *Apologia*, it is scarcely fair to say that Newman neglected this fact of experience. It was with him constantly during the last years of his Anglican career. Nor is it quite just to say that "Newman had gracefully overlooked this difficulty by making a scholastic distinction between convictions and certitudes." However unsatisfactory may be the argument of the *Grammar of Assent*, it cannot fairly be called scholastic, nor I think can it be reasonably denied that there is a subjective as well as objective difference between those opinions which Newman called convictions and those which he called certitudes. Froude as a Victorian scientist neglected too much the psychological factors in belief. Newman as a religionist minimized the effect of evidence. There is a qualitative difference, as Newman insisted, between difficulties and doubts, but a sum of difficulties do in fact produce doubt. A thousand difficulties may not produce a doubt but a thousand and one will.

T. L. Harris.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE LETTERS OF STEPHEN GARDINER

Edited by JAMES ARTHUR MULLER, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1933. xxxvi, 573 pages. \$10.50.

For generations scholars have neglected the work of the great leader of the conservative party during the English Reformation. Now they are busily engaged in remedying this oversight. Professor Muller published a fine biography of Gardiner in 1926. Four years later the Canterbury and York Society printed Gardiner's episcopal register and M. Pierre edited his political tracts. Now Mr. Muller presents a collection of one hundred and seventy-three of the statesman's letters. The volume contains all the available communications written by Gardiner in his own name, except four lengthy contributions on the pronunciation of Greek which have been published in full elsewhere. There is an appendix of five other Gardiner documents, including hitherto unpublished letters from Somerset and Pole and a lost tract against William Turner. All the materials have been edited with great care. Variant manuscripts have been collated and the original texts reproduced, so far as that is possible in print. The letters are grouped according to chronological periods and each section is preceded by an introductory note. There are a good index, a useful glossary, and an interesting list of about three hundred words which appear in the documents at dates earlier than the first instances noted in the *New English Dictionary*. It is to be regretted, however, that considerations of space prevented the inclusion of the letters written by Gardiner in his name and that of one or more colleagues on diplomatic missions. While the editor feels that they do not afford as intimate an expression of the author's views as does the material included, there are

certainly exceptions. For example, the remarkable letter which Gardiner wrote the king concerning the visit of Fox and himself to Cambridge in the matter of the royal divorce might very well take precedence over the perfunctory and routine correspondence which fills its place.

As is to be expected, the tone of the communications varies with the period concerned. The earlier letters are primarily devoted to matters of politics and diplomacy. Those of the reign of Edward VI show the imprisoned bishop laboring hard to stem the Protestant flood with theological arguments. But the volume presents little new material for any general reinterpretation of Gardiner's character, although more than twenty-five of the letters have not been previously published, even in the calendared form of the *Letters and Papers*. Most of these, however, the editor had combed quite thoroughly in his biography, which, in fact, might well be considered as the editorial introduction to the present volume. Many of the details of events in Gardiner's career, however, are set forth for the first time in the notes to the new work, and all careful students of the period will find it very useful.

M. M. Knappen.

The University of Chicago.

AN INDIAN PREACHER IN ENGLAND

Edited by LEON BURR RICHARDSON. Hanover, N. H.: Dartmouth College Publications, 1933. 376 pages. \$4.00.

This is the second in a series of eight volumes planned by Dartmouth College, based upon manuscripts in the possession of the College, relating to the founding and early history of that institution. The first volume, *Letters of Eleazer Wheelock's Indians*, edited by James Dow McCallum, appeared in 1932. The present volume is a collection of letters and diaries relating to the mission to the British Isles of the Rev. Nathaniel Whitaker and the Rev. Samson Occom, the latter a Mohegan Indian, for the purpose of raising funds for the Rev. Eleazer Wheelock's Indian Charity School located at Lebanon, Connecticut. The mission covered a period of more than two years, from January 1766 to March 1768, and was the most successful enterprise of its kind attempted during the period of the colonies. Collections were made in 305 churches and subscriptions received from 2,169 persons in England, totaling £9497, while £2529 were received from Scotland, the grand total amounting to more than twelve thousand pounds.

The editor, who is a professor of chemistry in Dartmouth College, has supplied a brief Introduction setting forth the necessary background for an understanding of the documents, which make up the bulk of the volume. As a whole the task of editing has been carefully done, though there are indications, here and there, that the professor of chemistry might have gained some valuable suggestions from the history department. The notes appended to most of the documents are often enlight-

ening, but nowhere is there a single reference to sources of information, which would seem to this reviewer a serious defect. The letters and other documents are arranged chronologically, but with no attempt at grouping into chapters. A calendar of the papers would have supplied a handy and necessary tool for the use of the documents.

The bulk of the documents consist of Wheelock and Whitaker letters, the actual number of Oocom papers being relatively few. The editor in his introduction rightfully gives principal credit for the success of the mission to George Whitefield, since it was Whitefield who introduced the agents, Whitaker and Oocom, to his influential English friends, among them Lord Dartmouth and Lady Huntingdon.

The materials, here for the first time published, have a much larger value than that of setting forth the early history of Dartmouth College. Both for the student of the social history of New England and eighteenth century England these documents present a most revealing cross section of interests and personages of the time. Personally I feel under deep obligation to Dartmouth College for making available these interesting and valuable historical materials.

William W. Sweet.

University of Chicago.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES AND THE PAPACY

By S. HERBERT SCOTT. London: Sheed & Ward, 1928. 404 pages. 15 s.

The remarkable feature of this "best book on papal supremacy," as the publishers characterize it, is that it was written by an Anglican rector. Why he should still be an Anglican rector—if that be the case—is not at all clear. Its objective is to prove that the Eastern Orthodox churches prior to the Photian schism recognized the papal supremacy not as one of honor but as of jurisdiction *de jure divino*.

The study is exhaustive as far as references which could be used to support this particular thesis are concerned. Even then, however, the quotations are not always fairly used. In quoting Vl. S. Solovev on p. 11 (whom by the way he presents as a representative of the official Orthodox view!), the author leaves out of the quotation the qualifying clauses which contradict the whole thesis he is trying to prove. On p. 104, quoting the historian Socrates, the author neglects to point out that this passage is not in harmony with what Athanasius, who was personally involved in the matter, says about it. On page 105 the author quotes from Socrates a passage (E. H. II, 15) to the effect that Pope Julius restored Athanasius and Paul to their respective sees, after they had been deposed. But he omits to say that when Julius' letters were received by the Eastern bishops to whom they were addressed, they assembled at a council at Antioch, and there "dictated a reply to his letters as the expression of the unanimous feeling of the whole synod. It was not in his province, they

said, to take cognizance of their decisions in reference to any whom they wish to expel from their churches; seeing that they had not opposed themselves to him, when Novatus was expelled from the church." Does not this prove that the pope of Rome did *not* possess juridical supremacy over the Eastern church, rather than that he did? What can one say of the author's honesty in the use of sources, when he deliberately suppresses the part contrary to his theory? Such examples could be multiplied almost indefinitely. Expressions which affirm supremacy of honor on the part of Rome are used as proofs of its supremacy of jurisdiction. A good example of this is the discussion of the celebrated canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon (Chap. X) in which the author argues that the fathers tacitly acknowledged the juridical primacy of Rome; why then did they continue to acknowledge the validity of that canon, seeing that Rome never acknowledged it?*

In dealing with quotations from St. Chrysostom (pp. 127 ff), although the author concedes that the Eastern father interprets the crucial passage in Matt. xvi, 18 in the sense that the church is to be built "on the faith of his (Peter's) confession," and although he does not even attempt to bridge the gulf between Peter and his successors (granting for argument's sake the Petrine "episcopacy" in Rome), for the passage quoted says nothing in regard to basing the church on Peter's successors, yet the author uses the whole as in support of his thesis.

Besides this reprehensible use of the sources, the author completely neglects to state anything which might militate against his theory. Could he not find any indication of the theory that the five patriarchates possessed powers of autonomy, although they granted Rome primacy of honor as "*primus inter pares*"? Of course, the question is not whether he could find it, but how he could miss it. Altogether, the author is not a historian, impartially investigating a subject, but an advocate, defending a theory.

That being the case, Dr. Scott's work must be adjudged as one of the outstanding examples of biased, partisan use of history for the purpose of proving a controversial point. For an open-minded, objective study of the subject his work has no value.

Matthew Spinka.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

SAINT CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA

By CHRYSOSTOM PAPADOPOULOS. Alexandria: Patriarchal Press, 1933. 483 pages. Drachmae 25.

The present Archbishop of Athens, a distinguished Eastern Orthodox prelate and historian, has produced a carefully written Greek biography of Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria, in which the interest centers about his

*Incidentally, the quotation from V. V. Bolotov (p. 193) is contrary to Bolotov's many times reiterated statement in which he rejects the juridical primacy of Rome (Bolotov, V. V., *Lektsii po istorii drevnei tserkvi*, St. Petersburg, 1913, Vol. III, pp. 273 ff.)

detailed description of the events leading to the Council of Ephesus, and to the acts of that Council.

Despite the numerous recent works defending Nestorius' essential orthodoxy, the author takes the position that Cyril was fully justified in accusing the Patriarch of Constantinople of heresy. He affirms that Nestorius held to the end that Christ never became a man but only took the form of a man (page 335). As for Nestorius' own apology in the *Bazaar of Heracleides*, the author maintains that Nestorius asserted in this work that the two persons in Christ are united only ethically (page 338).

The Archbishop also resolutely combats the assertion made by many Western historians that Cyril merely carried out the dictates of Pope Celestius, as if he had acknowledged the latter's supreme jurisdiction over the entire Church. He insists that Cyril acted in utter disregard of any such theory and that no single reference in behalf of the primacy of the bishop of Rome can be found in Cyril's authentic writings. He moreover asserts that in his famous Tome, which was accepted by the Council of Chalcedon as an authoritative definition of the Christological dogma, Leo was dependent upon the writings and teachings of Cyril. The author gives a parallel list of readings (pages 365 to 366) in which he points out the dependence of Leo upon Cyril.

In spite of the fact that the author presents Cyril as an able politician, he undertakes on the whole to defend him against any aspersions that are brought against him, particularly by Protestant historians. His book well illustrates the defensive attitude of the Eastern Orthodox historians toward this great father of the Church. The book is well written and documented but it is to be regretted that it does not include a bibliography and a complete index.

G. E. Zachariades.

POPE BONIFACE VIII AND HIS TIMES

By DON LOUIS TOSTI. Translated by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Eugene J. Donnelly. New York: Leland, 1933. 546 pages. \$3.25.

Luigi Tosti, a devout monk and a painstaking historian, wrote this work to vindicate Boniface VIII from the defamatory statements of Dante and other adversaries. It was published in Italian (*Storia di Bonifazio VIII e de Suoi Tempi*) in two volumes in 1846. A French translation by the Abbé Marie-Duclos appeared in 1854, and Mgr. Donnelly's translation, of which the present volume is an unconfessed reprint, in 1911. The footnotes and appended documents conform to the original.

The reissue of the book would have been more justifiable if we were not now in possession of H. K. Mann's up-to-date treatment of the subject in a work written from a similar viewpoint and on a similar scale (*Lives of the Popes*, Vol. XVIII, 1932). To the historical worker Tosti's treatise has the interest of a record of the undeveloped state of research

on Boniface in the middle of the nineteenth century. In the Translator's Preface we are told—in language borrowed from the French translator—that it is “not a controversial work” but “a work of historical reparation.” Schaff has called it “a glorification of Boniface;” Mann, with more sympathy, refers to it as “of acknowledged excellence if not of minute accuracy.” There is truth in all these characterizations. The book was written with malice toward none, but with exaggerated veneration for the hero. It seems unnecessary to enter upon an extended review of a work so completely antiquated.

John T. McNeill.

The University of Chicago.